The Journal of Historical Review

This Issue:

Dr. James J. Martin
CONSCRIPTION—40 Years Ago

Harry Elmer Barnes
REVISIONISM AND PEACE

Willis A. Carto
On the Uses of History

NEMESIS LEGALIS: Inquiry on Trial
- Abuses of 'Judicial Notice'
- *The Declaration of Mark Weber*

BOOK REVIEWS:
The new Dawidowicz opus & others

Volume Three, Number One *Spring 1982*

The Journal of Historical Review

Volume Three, Number One **Spring 1982**

EDITOR
THOMAS J. MARCELLUS

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DR. WALTER BEVERAGGI ALLENDE
UNIVERSITY OF BUENOS AIRES, Buenos Aires

DR. AUSTIN J. APP
LA SALLE COLLEGE, Philadelphia (Ret.)

JOHN BENNETT
VICTORIAN COUNCIL FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES
Melbourne, Australia

DR. REINHARD K. BUCHNER
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, Long Beach

DR. ARTHUR R. BUTZ
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, Evanston

DR. ROBERT FAURISSON
UNIVERSITY OF LYON-2, Lyon, France

DITLIEB FELDERER
Revisionist History Magazine, Täby, Sweden

PERCY L. GREAVES JR.
Free Market Economist

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
The New Libertarian, Long Beach

DR. MARTIN A. LARSON
The Spotlight, Washington D.C.

DR. JAMES J. MARTIN
INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW

DR. REVILO P. OLIVER
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, Urbana

DR. WILHELM STÄGLICH
Retired Judge, West Germany

UDO WALENDY
VERLAG FÜR VOLKSTUM & ZEITGESCHICHTSFORSCHUNG
Vlotho/Weser, West Germany

DR. CHARLES E. WEBER
UNIVERSITY OF TULSA, Oklahoma

DR. ANDREAS R. WESSERLE
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY, Milwaukee (Ret.)

The Journal of Historical Review is published quarterly by the Institute for Historical Review, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, United States of America. Subscription prices are as follows: One year, U.S.$20; two years, U.S.$35; three years, U.S.$50—or the equivalent in foreign currency. Foreign subscribers should add U.S.$5 if paying with a remittance drawn on a foreign bank. For domestic First Class delivery add $5 per year. For Overseas Air Mail add U.S.$12 per year. Bulk subscription rates are available on request. Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the Editor, but must be accompanied by return postage.

Listed:

Library of Congress
British Library
Encyclopedia of Associations
Writers Market 1981
PTLA Catalog

ISSN: 0195-6752

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, U.S.A.

Permission is hereby granted for reprints of any article contained herein, providing that no changes or alterations are made prior to off-printing, and also providing that the following attribution appears with the article:

"Reprinted by permission of *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, United States of America. Subscription rate: U.S.$20 per year."

Two copies of each off-print should be submitted to the Editor of *The Journal of Historical Review*.

CONTENTS

Correspondence 5

Peacetime Registration for Conscription—Forty Years Ago 15
Dr. James J. Martin

On the Uses of History 27
Willis A. Carto

Declaration of Mark Edward Weber 31

Facts, Allegations and Judicial Notice 47
Counsel for Defendants

Revisionism and the Promotion of Peace 53
Harry Elmer Barnes

Book Reviews 85

About the Contributors 96

A Note From The Editor

The issue you now hold in your hands marks the beginning of our third year of continuous on-time publication of *The Journal of Historical Review*—an accomplishment of no small magnitude considering the incessant and sundry counter-efforts of the forcefully disagreeable.

You may notice that many of the pages herein have been set in a slightly smaller type and have a bit more depth. These improvements were incorporated with the distinct aim of bringing our readers an increased amount of reading without having to sacrifice to the higher costs associated with printing and mailing a heavier book.

But the sheer amount of quality Revisionist material available has been growing steadily of late, motivating us to make even futher expansion plans for *The Journal*.

So, beginning with the next issue (Summer 1982), subscribers will be receiving a new 128-page quarterly rather than the usual 96-pages.

Additionally, we'll be setting the type sufficiently large to be comfortably read, but somewhat smaller than earlier issues.

Together, these changes will amount to about twice the material per issue, but with an accompanying subscription rate increase to only $30 per year. As we expand *The Journal* format, incorporating more articles, costs necessarily increase—typesetting, printing, mailing, fees, etc. But this is the price that must be paid to facilitate the publication of much more of the important Revisionist material and, at the same time, cover our costs, thereby ensuring the continued financial viability of both *The Journal* and the IHR.

Of course, the *IHR Newsletter*—as a more topical update and supplement to *The Journal*—will still be mailed regularly to our subscribers at no additional charge. So, you won't be paying more for less, but a little more for proportionately much more.

Now, to *this* issue. We have a self-published Barnes piece that has not appeared in any previous IHR publications; a revealing and analogous look at conscription by Dr. Jim Martin; a concise survey of the uses of history by the IHR's founder, Willis Carto; and two articles—one by Mark Weber—that make for an essential understanding of one of the more ominous aspects of the $17 million lawsuit against the IHR.

We also have plenty of appropriate correspondence and numerous book reviews.

And, as always, your comments and suggestions are encouraged.

Correspondence

COMMENTS ON LAST ISSUE

Dr. Howard Stein's letter of the 13th April (*The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1981) honors him and (*pace* Signor Maiolini) adds to the intellectual caliber of the great debate. To Stein's "tu quoque" in regard to sociobiology and in defense of psychohistory, I must ruefully concede (to change the language employed) "touché." I am very willing also to concede his charge that the re-examination of the holocaust myth is by no means without ulterior motives.

It seems to me that there are two problems involved. The first is the historical piety of seeking, as far as is ever possible when dealing with the intangible past, objective truth. The second is an attempt to deal with the enormously destructive effect of this particular myth upon our culture, civilization, society and politics. There can be, I think, little doubt that the uncritical acceptance of the holocaust myth as a kind of "holy writ" has been of immense financial and political profit to Israel. But that is the least important of its effects. It has inhibited and distorted all studies of race; it has inhibited any rational discussion of the increasingly urgent question of eugenics; it has paralyzed the implementation of a rational foreign policy by the United States and its client kingdoms;and it has perpetuated an unjust and unhealthy teutonophobia in the general public. In sum, it has distorted and, indeed, poisoned, the corporate mind of Western Civilization.

Professor Stein advocates empathy. I entirely agree. As any competent actor knows, there can be no valid understanding of a character (and, by extension, of a people) without that imaginative leap "inside" that character. But empathy is not synonymous with sympathy or advocacy. But again I must honor Dr. Stein. Neither scientists nor historians can be detached automata without ties and loyalties. History "wie es eigentlich gewesen" is a noble but impossible aim. Nevertheless we must seek the truth as far as is humanly possible. It must be acutely painful and require great integrity and courage for Dr. Stein to question in any degree the holocaust myth.

History is inevitably replete with myths. No historical statement beyond the crude basic level of dates and names is, or ever can be, the whole and absolute truth. But some myths are far more dangerous than others. And that is my answer to Dr. Stein's question: "Why do I need to disprove this particular myth and not some other?"

On a different matter, I must say that I found Dr. Wesserle's article, "Bombs on Britain" somewhat irritating. Churchill was a megalomaniacal monster. His involvement in the dirty business of the *Lusitania*, his deliberate and skillfull promotion of a war psychosis in Britain in the

1930s (in the service of his own insatiable ambition), his commitment (for the same reason) to "unconditional surrender," which resulted in the destruction of that British empire of whose perpetuation he so often claimed to be the dedicated champion; the plans to use gas and, even more horrible, anthrax bombs on Germany—all these things are indictment enough. But for Dr. Wesserle to complain that the Anglo-American air forces dropped more bombs on Germany than the Germans did on Britain is to divert from the essential point; Germany simply lacked the capacity to do things on the same scale. I have nothing but sympathy for Germany. I think she was treated in 1919 with appalling injustice and cruelty; that Hitler's aims of reversing the Carthaginian verdict of Versailles were wholly reasonable and just; that the Second World War was suicidal insanity and that the declaration of war on Germany by Britain and France in 1939 was monstrously criminal. But after all that has been admitted, it is still ridiculous to suggest that war, once it is in progress, should be restricted to a sporting balance of forces between the belligerents.

Wayland D. Smith, Ph.D.

REVISIONISM A LA FREUD?

I've just completed reading the new issue of *The Journal for Historical Review* (Winter 1981). You've put together a really great issue. Devastating. Faurisson, Wesserle, Lutton—all great!

I was interested to read Ezio M. Maiolini's rather anxious letter on Dr. Stein. I know any "Freudian" connotations drives some of your readers up the wall! But we can learn from the neo-Freudians as well as the libertarians. I'm not a Freudian myself but there's some important stuff being written by the psychohistorians that we can't ignore. By the way, if Ezio would read some of Dr. Stein's other material he'd discover that Howard does make mention of the situation in 17th Century Ukraine! On the other hand, I agree that some of the psychohistorian's ruminations about a "feminized France," etc. turn me off!

Bezalel Chaim
The Revisionist Press

DITTO?

We thank you for printing the letter by Ezio M. Maiolini in your Winter 1981 issue. We, "don't want the events of World War II apologized or psychoanalyzed into history," either!

We will add to his comments about *Commentary* or *The American Spectator* that, speaking for ourselves, we do not subscribe to these because they are the type of publications that they are. We do subscribe to *The Journal* because of its historical value!

Mr. Maiolini's letter makes some good points!

Mr. & Mrs. L.E. Wicks

MORE ON "ORADOUR"

Thank you for your letter of 23 November. I should learn my lesson by now and wait at least a few days before responding to something that irritates me. I won't be so intemperate this time and will try and give an overview of the German side of the "Oradour" story as well as respond to Mr. Beck (see *The JHR*, Winter 1981).

Actually, I was very happy to read Mr. Lutton's "The Miracle of Dunkirk Reconsidered" book review, as it helped fill in the pieces for some research that I have been working on for years. Unfortunately I didn't encounter this piece until after having already written you!

I am enclosing a clipping that you may have already seen from a Sunday newspaper magazine supplement titled *Parade*, which is rather notorious for its propaganda pieces. I assume this little piece is probably based on Mr. Beck's work. The line about the SS departing the town singing and playing accordions is so ludicrous that it defies all credibility!

At any rate, I have more than enough information on hand to I hope effectively refute some of Mr. Beck's contentions. I am enclosing also for your benefit a photocopy of my article on "Oradour" that appeared in *Siegrunen* #21. Mr. Beck did not really address himself to the most important points made therein. It is also fairly apparent that Mr. Beck is probably totally ignorant of the German point-of-view. I would have assumed that in writing his book he would have at least consulted the writings left behind by German "survivors" of the "Oradour" incident. The fact that he probably didn't makes it a little difficult for me to take his work seriously!

Here then are the most important points of the "Oradour" story from the German side:

1) 9 June 1944: Obersturmfuehrer Gerlach, ordnance officer of the 2nd SS Assault Gun detachment/"Das Reich" Division is ambushed by French partisans and taken into a town for interrogation. The signpost to the town reads: Oradour-sur-Glane. The town is filled with signs of partisan activity. Gerlach is sentenced to death and escapes execution only after his driver obstructs the executioner giving Gerlach the chance to flee. His testimony is given later in the day to both the commander of the "Der Fuehrer" Regiment and its "Oradour" Battalion (Sturmbannfuehrer Dieckmann). Thus prior to the massacre there is strong evidence of partisan-terrorist activity and collusion in Oradour itself. This was recorded in the divisional *Tagebuch* for 9 June 1944.

2) During the night of 9/10 June, Sturmbannfuehrer Kaempfe was captured and then murdered by French partisans. He commanded the 3rd Battalion/"Der Fuehrer." Even though he had already been killed partisan representitives sent a ransom demand to the "Der Fuehrer" command post on the morning of 10 June. Two local Frenchmen also brought information that an important German officer was being held by the partisans in the town of Oradour. Sturmbannfuehrer Adolf Kiekmann, a close friend of Kaempfe decided to follow up on this information with two platoons from 3rd Company/1st Battalion/Regiment "Der Fuehrer."

3) Diekmann and his task force reached the outskirts of Oradour-sur-Glane by the early afternoon of 10 June. A rear area German medical dressing station was encountered en route. It had been severly fire damaged. Inside were found the shackled and chained bodies of German wounded and medics who had been burned alive inside of the building by the partisans. At this point Diekmann's duty became clear: according to the "Sperrle Decree," any act of terror committed against German forces behind the frontlines had to be met with an immediate punitive response. The town of Oradour, which had already been implicated twice, by Ostuf. Gerlach and the French informers, was now going to feel a reprisal action no matter what.

4) Diekmann's command entered Oradour and rounded up the citizenry. The Mayor was questioned as to the extent of partisan activities in the area and the wherabouts of Stubaf. Kaempfe. He professed ignorance. At this point one platoon was told to search the houses. Nearly every building which they entered yielded up a supply of illicit weapons! On this question the survivors of the platoon are adament.

5) By now there was no longer *any* question about the links between the villagers and the partisans. The Mayor was sent out of the north end of the town with instructions to bring back Stubaf. Kaempfe alive within 30 minutes. If he failed to do so the men in the village would be shot. Naturally he failed to return. According to the soldiers the village men were marched out into a nearby field after a half-hour had passed and shot. Stubaf. Diekmann then ordered the destruction of the village. The women and children were to be held in the church, which was the only building ordered to be spared!

6) The SS troops—a majority of whom were French citizens due to their Alsatian birth—began igniting the houses. There was no thought that the fire would get out of control. The church was specifically *not* to be set afire; the women and children were there both for their safety and so as not to interfere with the operations. No one had any idea that hidden partisan munition caches would quickly take the fire out of control, yet this was what happened.

7) The soldiers had to protect themselves from the hail of zig-zagging bullets that came out of the burning buildings. There were also numerous explosions caused by grenades or high explosives that had also been secreted. All surviving soldiers are clear on one point; the church attic or belfry burst into flames from possibly a stray mortar round (not of German manufacture!). This in turn touched off a munitions cache hidden in the top of the church which spelled the end of the 500 women and children inside of the building. All of the defendents at the post-war "Oradour" trial testified to this point independently. Nothing could be done to provide assistance, the inferno killed everyone in a matter of a few minutes at best.

Had the church been intended for use as a place of execution it is inconceivalbe that the men of the village would not have been placed in there as well. But such was not the case! The atrocity writers have never been able to explain this oversight on the part of the super-efficient Germans.

9) All personnel involved in this incident were filled with horror and disbelief. Accounts of the SS departing from Oradour singing and playing accordions are ludicrous. Stubaf. Diekmann, somewhat in a state of shock reported all of the details to the "Der Fuehrer" commander, who was also horrified by the loss of the women and children. He referred the matter on to the Divisional commander who chose to postpone any investigation until after "Das Reich's" critical combat mission in Normandy was fulfilled. Stubaf. Diekmann accepted full personal responsibility for the tragedy and vowed to die on the battlefield to restore the honor of the regiment. To this end he refused any further to wear a steel helmet in combat and he died a short time later from a shell splinter in the head.

10) In December 1953 the Vice-chairman of the French communist party openly admitted that Oradour-sur-Glane was used as a regional headquarters and armory for a communist partisan band during the war.

11) While Oradour's fate was a tragic incident of war, the blame for what happened must be shared by all sides—it was by no means an exclusive German "war crime," there is enough evidence to demonstrate that by now!

As for Mr. Beck's specific points in his letter to the Winter 1981 *Journal*.

a) Mr. Beck found evidence of the use of bullets and grenades inside of the church, which is interesting because bullets and grenades composed the better part of the stored partisan armaments!

b) As for Madame Rouffanche, she most certainly would have been shot if she had tried to make a run for it so there is no contesting this point!

c) As for shooting the men in barns and other buildings this is possible, but the surviving soldiers do not remember doing this. Incidentally, the village of Oradour was back in partisan hands for the two days following the incidents and a number of "embellishments" were thought to have been made during this period. The most interesting being that some of the bodies were relocated to the oven of the town bakery. An effort was made to indict the SS men for having stuffed some people alive in the ovens—but this was later proved to have happened after the fact and after the SS were out of the area! It is therefore within the realms of possibility that the partisans may have relocated some of the bodies of the executed men.

d) For the record, Stubaf. Diekmann's two platoons at Oradour did not have any explosives, flame-throwers or heavy weapons with them, although post-war atrocity writers have since bestowed these items upon them. That the damage to the town came from more than just "fire" seems self-evident from the photographs and indeed from Mr. Beck's personal testimony. The probability that much of the extensive damage was caused by stored partisan munitions is quite likely given all of the evidence and testimony.

e) I cannot even imagine how Mr. Beck could write an entire book on Oradour and not even seem to know how to spell the name of the gentleman who took upon himself the full blame for the incident, Stubaf. Adolf Diekmann. To call him mentally unbalanced is somewhat of a slander.

Diekmann's decision to sacrifice himself was an act of personal honor and not madness!

I happen to personally believe that the German side of the "Oradour" story is, by and large, the correct one. The SS men may have been many things, but they were not liars or criminals, and they had a "code of honor" to live up to. In contrast the partisans in France and elsewhere, were often recruited from the criminal underworld or the indigenous communist movement and carried out a campaign of unscrupulous terrorism that defies any moral standards whatsoever!

What is probably most irritating about Mr. Beck's book and the massive "Nazi-atrocity" publishing industry, is that they are able to promote one side of a story as "holy writ" while totally ignoring the other side of the picture. Of course this is perhaps the reason for the existence of the *Journal of Historical Review*.

Thank you for letting me make the above points. At least it will give some people a different perspective on the situation.

Richard Landwehr

COMMENTS ON THE LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

I thank you very much for the winter issue of *The Journal of Historical Review*. As usual, I found the book captivating to the point of being able to complete the entire work in a matter of hours.

The two articles by Dr. Faurisson on the "Gas chambers" rated right up there with Dr. Buchner's thesis on "The Problem of Cremator Hours" (*The JHR*, Fall 1981). I am amazed beyond description at Mr. Faurisson's forensic abilities in destroying with seeming ease the entire holocaust edifice of the past 36 years. I sincerely hope the good doctor will win his appeal against the French courts who seem to be caught in the same time warp as their German counterparts!

I am absolutely sickened at the turn of events in your case with Mr. Mermelstein and Cox. What a lame "defense" to fall back on! Judicial notice of what? Survivor testimony? The question should be raised "gassed with what substance?" "Gassed in what facilities?"

I am confident, however, of Mark Weber's abilities in preparing a devastating thesis for the IHR in this case. However concerned as I am about the future of IHR and intellectual freedom I must ask if you have considered presenting before the "court" (*kangaroo*) the four revealing documents concerning the use of zyclon B as cited by Dr. Faurisson in his thesis "The Gas Chambers; Truth or Lie?" They are Nurnberg Documents;

a. NI-9098- Degesch's field of operations; eight lectures on aspects of.

b. NI-9912- Directives for the use of prussic acid (zyclon) *For the Destruction of Vermin*!

Two technical studies by Gerhard Peters: (contained in the Library of Congress.)

a. "Blausaure zur Schadlingsbekampfung"(QD1, S2, N.F. HFT. 20 1933) 75pp

b. "Die Hochwirksamen Gase und Dampfe in der Schadlingsbekampfung" (QD1, S2, N.F., HFT. 47A, 1942) 143pp

These works in themselves should be sufficient to destroy Mr. Cox and Mermelstein's vile attempts at stifling genuine inquiry into an area of "managed history." As I see it Mr. Mermelstein is attempting to continue (1) The falsification of history, (2) Attempting to circumvent the Constitutions's Bill of Rights under the provision of a person's right to dissent, (3) Defamation of character in accusing the Germans of murder while offering no evidence as to the alledged murder weapon i.e. ("gas chambers"). It would be proper in this circumstance for the Steuben Society to prepare legal action against Mr. Mermelstein for defamation of character.

Please keep me informed of progress regarding legal action and of Mr. Faurisson's success with the French inquisitors. Please find enclosed two years subscription remittal.

Theodore G. Sterner, Jr.

MONUMENT-BUILDING FOR FUN & PROFIT

Just a few remarks about "Remembering the 'Holocaust' " on page 5 of newsletter of Sept. How about:

a) An Armenian Memorial Park of 1915 to commemorate the butchery of more than two million Armenians by the Turks.

b) A Famine Memorial Park to commemorate the mass starvation deaths of millions of Irish by their British masters in the 1850s.

c) A Russian Patriot Memorial Park to commemorate the 70 million plus Russian Christians who have been slaughtered by the Mongols who styled themselves "Russian" bolsheviks, since 1917.

d) A Wounded Knee Memorial Park for all the Sioux.

e) A Mai Lai Memorial Park.

f) A Japanese-American Internment Memorial Park.

Surely Americans of Armenian, Irish, Russian, Sioux, Vietnamese and Japanese ancestry have a right to have their history memorialized by a 27 acre section of some Denver park by the city since there are certainly Americans of such descent living in and paying taxes to the Denver government.

The reason that these "survivors" in the U.S. always get their largesse is simply because they scream and shout so much and all the rest of us simply stay silent and apathetic.

H.R. MacDonough, M.D.

ZIONISM'S VESTED INTEREST

Enclosed are two letters to the editor of the Los Angeles *Times* which are almost identical. Also, the local talkshow hostess was delighted to tell the audience about Johnson's ruling. She reluctantly let me make a few points before she cut me off.

The article "Holocaust Given Legal Recognition" (Los Angeles *Times* 10 Oct) raises several important questions:

Is it now illegal—punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both—to doubt the reality of the "Holocaust"?

Given the fact that there has been considerable evolution, mutation, and contradiciton in the "Holocaust" story, what is the "legal" version?

In recent years we've witnessed the judiciary extending their purview beyond mere interpretation of law. It has played a major role in determining public—especially social—policy. Is the precedent now set for judicial involvement in all questions of history? Are we moving toward total thought control?

I should like to recall for the benefit of the academic and legal folks that Judge Johnson based his decision on: "Any number of sources. Many books. Sources of reasonably undisputed accuracy." When requested to name these or produce them he impatiently refused to do so. Traditionally, judges rule on the admissibility of evidence; Judge Johnson seems to have developed a disdain for it.

I'm sure you've thought about this, but what would happen if Johnson ruled the other way? Could we trashcan the Nuremberg Trials? Would the billions in German "reparations" have to be paid back? Would the wrongfully accused and convicted immigrant American citizens be exonorated, repatriated and recompensed? How about all the perjury convictions (for Rabbis, too)? Rascals and thugs like Wiesenthal, Mermelstein, etc., etc., would be exposed for what they are. I believe if the judge had even refused to rule (if he couldn't give a fair ruling—it would take real character), it would have been the end of Zionism. I sure hope there will be an appeal.

Paul G. Smith

MAKING IT ALL SIMPLER

I read your Fall, 1981 issue of *The Journal of Historical Review*.

The article on "Cremator Hours and Incineration Time" was quite fascinating, as was the one by Staglich on West German Justice.

However, and I submit this in all kindness, is it not probable that such arguments could be presented with less words?

I suggest that many readers would simply give up because of many statements, all arriving at the same conclusion, repeated over and over.

Other patriots have pointed out the inability of our younger generation to read because of the deliberately created chaos called "our educational system." I think they are right. It also follows that writing for purposes of informing the public should be directed at the intelligent American who has *less* ability to understand words than his grandfather had instead of being directed to the IQ genius in the top 1/10th of 1% of the population.

I realize you feel your arguments should be presented in a "scholarly" fashion. However, "scholarly" arguments reach a microscopic proportion of the population today.

Pastor Sheldon Emry

MORAL SUPPORT

I have read your publications on the Holocaust debate and agree to the fullest extent with the experts' findings of facts on this subject.

It pains me as a German-American to see the effect today of this monumental falsification of history on relations between the U.S. and Germany and also in our own relations as naturalized citizens with the Jewish portion of the U.S. population. I believe that never in the history of all mankind has such an infamous and calculated monstrosity of whole-sale falsification of history been perpetrated on such a scale. It is equally sad for me to see that there seems no end to this.

I should like to compliment the authors of your articles for their efforts and at the same time commend them all for their courage in the face of an overwhelmingly hostile press, public and academic community. It takes true courage to stand up and be counted in the light of such odds.

Hermann A.Gerke

WE'RE BLUSHING

Since "The Donation of Constantine" has a force ever been so badly outnumbered, or faced so ruthless a foe, or fought for such lofty goals? Much more is at stake here than mere academic truth. The consequences of stifling the truth are nothing less than the world's economy in tatters, nuclear disaster hovering on all sides, and the rudderless West turning in circles.

Yours is surely the bravest, loneliest, most perilous fight imaginable in these times...and the most important. Have no illusions: the wider you pry open the shutters, the greater your personal peril. The loss of your livelihoods and even of your lives may serve as tragic proof that the Institute is beginning to make a difference. I salute you for braving death itself so that the truth may live.

My enclosed book order is a poor token of my heartfelt respect and encouragement for your work. As circumstances permit, I will follow this with more tangible help and support. In the meanwhile, please accept token orders and mere words for the debt of thanks that the West owes you.

Dr. R.H. Fischer

National Broadcasting Company, Inc.
NBC Morning Show Editor
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10020 16 December 1981

Yesterday morning a Phil Donahue segment was broadcast with his guests Mel Mermelstein and William Cox.

We take serious issue with what both Messrs. Mermelstein and Cox asserted as true.

Erroneous statements were made that we're sure gave the majority of your viewers a drastically distorted and even false picture of the work of our institute, any affiliations it may or may not have, and the nature of the controversy surrounding the lawsuit (*Mermelstein vs.IHR et al*) and the Holocaust in general.

We would like an opportunity to respond to the claims made by these two gentlemen.

Mr. Donahue had a copy of Dr. A.R. Butz' book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* which he presented and on which he based some of his questions to his guests. The Institute for Historical Review is the publisher of that book in the U.S.A. and we insist that your viewers were given a false impression as to the nature, purpose and scope of the book by the answers to Mr. Donahue's questions.

Therefore, Dr. Butz and I would like the opportunity to present our positions with respect to the statements made by Messrs. Mermelstein and Cox on an equal-time basis, on the same program with Mr. Donahue.

I trust you will consider this request in pursuit of a balanced presentation of all significant views on an issue at controversy.

Thomas J. Marcellus,
Director
Institute for Historical Review

Errata

Due to an unexpected hospitalization a number of errors, mainly in the indexing of references, appeared in "The Problem of Cremator Hours and Incineration Time" (*The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 2, #3, Fall 1981). I wish to apologize to the reader and submit herwith a list of corrections. Text and calculations remain unaffected by these corrections.

Dr. Reinhard K. Buchner
Westminster, CA 14 September 1981

p219, ref. 3 (page *103*) should read (page *23*); p229, ref. 13 (page *60*) should read (page *152*); p230, ref. (D. Felderer *11*, W. Staglich *16*) should read (D. Felderer *16*, W. Staglich *11*); p237, ref. 11 (. . . incineration times today.) add (page 75); p238, ref. 19 (page *181*) should read (page *214*); p240, ref. 19 (page *177*) should read (page *210*); p241, ref. 19 (page *177*) should read (page *210*); p242, ref. 22 (page *27*) should read (page *236*); p248, 20) Emil Aretz . . . *1979* should read *1970*; p228, The quote taken from Reitlinger 8 "The camp was open for business on 14 *January* 1940" (page 110) should read " . . . on 14 *June* 1940" (page 110).

* * *

Belated but grateful acknowlegement is hereby extended to *League Review*, 9/11 Kensington High St., London W8 5NP, for the following articles:

"Fire in the Reichstag," by Peter Wainwright (*The JHR*, Summer 1981).
"The Enigma of Lawrence," by Desmond Hansen (*The JHR*, Fall 1981).

Peacetime Registration for Conscription—Forty Years Ago

DR. JAMES J. MARTIN

On 16 October 1940 male residents of the United States between the ages of 18 and 35 registered nation-wide for possible induction into the armed services of the country. It was the first machinery for the introduction of peacetime conscription in the country's history, being the operational consequence of an act of Congress signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt a month earlier. It represented one of the visible results of a five-month attack on the sensibilities of the American public conducted by one of the best-financed and most thoroughly organized propaganda machines the land had ever known. It grew directly out of a wave of hysteria which swept the Eastern seaboard, in particular, following the disastrous fortunes of the French and British war parties in the military campaigns in the spring of 1940, when a hundred thousand German specialists overcame a massive Franco-British (largely conscript) army in a few weeks of May and June.

The German invasion of Poland early in September 1939 was followed by declarations of war on Germany by Britain and France, formally launching the Second World War. The swift termination of the Polish campaign was followed by several attempts to negotiate a peace, all of which were rejected by Britain and France (though there was little belligerent action taking place during these late months of 1939 and early months of 1940). But late March and early April 1940 indicated that the war was about to be spread the rest of the way across the Atlantic seaboard of Western Europe. As this began to happen, followed by new Anglo-French setbacks among their small buffer state allies, concern for the survival of the 1919-39 status quo began to

grow in the U.S.A. among the Eastern financial and industrial-commercial circles long entwined with their counterparts in Britain and France. The muscle, brains and money of the American North Atlantic Francophile and Anglophile traditionalists were not long in being mobilized a second time in support for this dying old order in Western Europe. Several programs began to enlist support, including drives for the supply of goods, money, military and naval hardware, and related matters. This was the short range aspect. The eventual supply of armed men was a more long range one, and the impulse to introduce conscription, originally announced as intended for service in the Western Hemisphere only, was the form in which this was expressed.

On 4 April 1940 the symbol of the British war party, Winston Churchill, assumed direction over what was euphemistically described as Britain's "defense program." Five days later the Germans frustrated a British effort to spread the war by pre-emptively occupying Denmark and Norway, and the effect in America was the unloosing of a surge of confused perturbation. The beneficiaries of the corrupt system installed in 1919 clearly saw that it would never survive without massive American support.

On 29 April 1940 there occurred a famous "secret" meeting in the offices of Lawyer Frederic R. Coudert, British legal advisor in the U.S.A. between 1915 and 1920. Among those attending were Thomas W. Lamont, probably the most influential alumnus of Harvard College, and a partner in the banking house of J.P. Morgan and Co., the firm which had the lion's share of the American investment in British victory in the war of 1917-1918. Also there were Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University and a ferocious warrior Anglophile, Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State under President Herbert Hoover (Republican) and soon to be Secretary of War under Roosevelt (Democrat), as well as Lewis Douglas, former Budget Director under the latter. In this prestigious and affluent company there was plotted out a number of dramatic and far-ranging changes in the United States' relations with the countries at war in western Europe, as well as momentous alterations in the way of life at home. (This famous secret meeting was leaked very soon, and was the subject of wide commentary at that

time; probably the most succinct account and what it portended was by Sen. D. Worth Clark, "The Men Behind Our War Scare," *Scribners' Commentator*, August 1940.)

The Harvard establishment serving as the advance attack in gearing American public opinion for war and conscription had hardly begun. On 17-19 May 1940 the Associated Harvard Clubs met in New York City, presided over by Lamont. Here, 34 members of the Class of 1917 drafted a subtly-worded letter addressed to the current Harvard class by way of the undergraduate newspaper, the *Crimson*, unbraiding the young men for their "lack of moral responsibility" in refusing to go along with the war drive. A similar blast came from Archibald MacLeish, the Librarian of Congress. MacLeish, an anti-war activist *par excellence* in 1935, and Robert Sherwood, the writer of a famous pacifist play, *Idiot's Delight*, in 1936, had become belligerent literary warriors by now, effecting a stunning *pirouette à deux* in enlisting in the brigades of the Administration's typewriter hussars.

Two days later (21 May 1940) the Harvard *Alumni Bulletin* printed in support of the hawkish contingent a letter which had appeared in the *New York Times* three days earlier, written by Grenville Clark, an opulent New York attorney and member of the Harvard Corporation, which contained a similar program to that which had originated in the famed 29 April hush-hush meeting. Clark, among other things, advocated a drafted army of 3,000,000 men. He reiterated this call in several subsequent public speeches, and in one which he delivered prior to that time, at a dinner in New York City on 8 May.

Continued student skepticism of the fright talk and suggestions that the U.S.A. was about to be invaded by German armies after finishing off France and Britain, drew other attacks. On Harvard Class Day, 18 June 1940, a Boston bond-broker denounced what he termed the "cowardice" of the undergraduates. And two days after that, James B. Conant, president of Harvard and an enthusiastic warrior as well (he was to become High Commissioner of occupied Germany about five years later), expressed deep regret over what he viewed as America's "creeping paralysis of our loyalties," by which he meant, presumably, to Britain's

war party. Conant's was one of a number of general attacks on the alleged "moral" weakness of the nation's young men, in which Lamont voiced agreement. But nothing was said about "morality" when it came to Lamont's friend and fellow Harvard alumnus, Richard Whitney, of the New York Stock Exchange, who had just previously been convicted and sent to prison.

On 7 June 1940 the lead New York *Times* editorial came out for immediate conscription. It was obvious Pres. Roosevelt and his aides were for it, but Congress, especially the House, did not favor action that fast. However, two weeks later (20 June) the conscription bill was introduced in the Senate. The first draft, which contemporaries such as Paul Mallon insisted had much of the handiwork of Grenville Clark and Julius Ochs Adler of the New York *Times* in it, originally called for registering all men between the ages of 18 and 65 (some forty-two million), and paying those who were to be selected from this number (an expected 7,000,000) the princely pay of $5 a month while in service. Grenville Clark, who functioned prominently in the Paramount Pictures Corporation reorganization, had just presented a bill for $957,000 for his services (see Thurman Arnold, *The Folklore of Capitalism*) a sum equivalent to several millions of dollars in 1981 puchasing power.*

In actuality, military service from this immense number does not seem to have been the desired goal of Roosevelt, despite the vociferous championing from Clark and Adler, as well as a large contingent of others such as Conant, Lamont, Stimson, W.J. "Wild Bill" Donovan (who was to be the first chief of the ancestor of the CIA, the Office of Strategic Services, or OSS), and others in the club reflected in *Who's Who* and the Social Register urging the adoption of this mobilization of cannon fodder for the support of Britain's war Tories. Roosevelt had in mind a universal service bill, a kind of majestic combination of all his projected agencies for mobilizing all the youth of both sexes into one or two years of "national service." He got instead the Burke-Wadsworth Bill.

The drive to install conscription, though highly desired by the Roosevelt regime, was a bi-partisan one, as was the resistance to it. The U.S.A. all through the late 1930s really

developed a war party and an anti-war party, both of which crossed over all ideological lines. A left-to-right spectrum grew on both sides of the struggle. An example is seen in the conscription bill itself, jointly sponsored by an anti-New Deal Democrat in the Senate, Edward R. Burke of Nebraska, defeated in the primaries and therefore not a candidate for re-election in the coming 1940 election, and a conservative Republican in the House of Representatives, James W. Wadsworth, from upstate New York, a long-time outspoken supporter of conscription since 1919. That such a pair could be found to put their names to a measure in support of the Administration's plans for the American future tells us much about the nature of the "two party system."

But contemporaries observing the affair pointed out that neither man had much of anything to do with the bill itself. The widely syndicated columnist Paul Mallon 7 Aug 1940 pointed out that the actual bill was a product of the Military Training Camps Association of New York, consisting of businessmen, attorneys and reserve officers, and showed the construction efforts of several persons, including Grenville Clark, Adler, the general manager of the New York *Times*, Col Donovan, Conant, and attorney Elihu Root, Jr., son of a former Republican Secretary of State. The bill contained among other things a 200-word sentence, a masterpiece of legalistic confused botchery, but which provided for the prosecution of "anyone who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform any duty required of him or in the execution of this act." While violation of the conscription act of 1917 was just a misdemeanor, violation of this new one was a felony, to be punished upon conviction by a possible five years in prison and a $10,000 fine. So, despite Roosevelt's hope to obtain a law which could be used to turn the armed forces into a gigantic welfare agency, he was being proffered a ferocious scheme to facilitate a level of militarism in the land utterly beyond comparison with any ever seen in the country previously.

On 25 July 1940 the bill was reported out of committee, and on the 31st, debate began in the Senate. At once, those Senators traditionally associated with the Populist-Progressive tradition took to the floor in bitter opposition, crossing the party lines in generous numbers. Based mainly in the

Midwest and High Plains states, they had substantial support from many other areas, stretching from West Virginia to Washington state and California, aided by Administration adversaries among the Republicans who were not notably identified with this Populist-Progressive background. Particularly resistant to this draft bill were Burton K. Wheeler of Montana, George Norris of Nebraska, Rush Holt of West Virginia, Ernest Lundeen and Gerald P. Nye of the Dakotas, Henrik Shipstead of Minnesota, Arthur Capper of Kansas, Bennett Champ Clark of Missouri, Edwin Johnson of Colorado, Hiram Johnson of California, and Homer Bone of Washington. But a substantial number of others were to ally themselves in the ensuing weeks of debate, and a roll call of all would occupy a lot of space: Walsh, Maloney, Tydings, Tobey, Lodge, Bridges, Reynolds, Danaher, Gillette of Iowa, Ashurst of Arizona, McCarran of Nevada, Frazier, Downey, Barbour, Overton, Townsend, to be joined by such powerful figures in the Republican conservative fold as Robert A. Taft of Ohio and Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan, both of whom were as bitterly opposed to the draft bill as Wheeler and Norris. In the House there were also formidable adversaries, including such as Hamilton Fish, Lewis Ludlow, Martin Dies, Joseph Martin of Massachusetts, and William Lemke, a stalwart of Midwest Populist farm loyalties and a particularly feared personality by the growing band of totalitarian liberals.

Wheeler was probably the most vigorous of the enemies of this bill, and earned himself the deep and unforgiving hostility of the Administration. His opposition began within days after the Burke-Wadsworth bill was introduced, well before debate began. Said Sen. Wheeler on 25 June 1940, speaking of the panic propaganda which accompanied its introduction: "I don't believe in any emergency. The only emergency is that conjured up in the minds of a few people who want to see us go to war and send our youth to Asia and Europe."

The list of the nationally-prominent people in opposition to the conscription bill is a very lengthy one, and grew during the Senate hearings in August. The Administration's supporters included a bi-partisan core of supporters of conscription with pedigrees extending back for 25 years,

many of them not from Roosevelt's own party. The journalistic lineup nationally was about 50-50, and probably was typified by the likes of Walter Lippmann among the pros and H.L. Mencken representing the antis. (Lippmann in the previous World War had enthusiastically recommended the draft to President Woodrow Wilson also, though a recent biographer points out that after its establishment as law in 1917, Lippmann was one of the very first to seek exemption from it.) Mencken in his 4 August 1940 piece in the Baltimore *Sun*, "Quick Step to War," thought many New Dealers were losing their enthusiasm of the spring and early summer for conscription, but that it had now become part of the offensive aimed at electing FDR for the third time, also upcoming. Nevertheless, enormous pressure was being put on people everywhere to go along with the effort to sell it. Pro-draft elements scared many from signing anti-conscription petitions, and the attitude among so many college faculties was so fiercely pro-conscription that most of their young male students grew inhibited and passive. *Time* magazine bellowed all through the hearings as though the bill had already been passed, and the rigged *Fortune* and Gallup polls showed increasing numbers favoring it. But some Senators, like Wheeler and Vandenberg, reported receiving many thousands of letters opposing the draft in July and August 1940. And the senatorial speeches against the Burke-Wadsworth bill got hotter. Wheeler on 10 August wanted the Administration to submit the question to a popular referendum: "If the proponents of conscription feel it is necessary to have the draft to save our democracy," Wheeler mocked their rhetoric, "they ought to be willing to submit the question to the people." But Wheeler knew full well Roosevelt did not dare to do that. He fully remembered two years before when the referendum proposed by Rep. Lewis Ludlow, which would have required a favorable national referendum before a war declaration, had been narrowly defeated by the application of incredible political pressure.

Others in the Senate added similar opposition. Walsh on 20 Aug insisted, "until voluntary enlistments on a fair basis had been tried, and there is evidence of a real need, I am not disposed to embrace, in peace time, the power of the

government to conscript." Hiram Johnson, who probably represented best on the Pacific Coast the anti-militarist strain in the Populist-Progressive impulse, denounced the draft bill as "a menace to our liberties," and others publicized the recently-republicized attack on the conscription drive of 125 years earlier, by Daniel Webster, in Charles A. Beard's recently-published *Rise of American Civilization*.

Sobered, the Senate Military Affairs Committee whittled down some of the dimensions of the proposed bill, especially in the age brackets contemplated for registration, as well as some of the language it contained. But Roosevelt importuned prestigious Army and Navy officers to testify against dependence on voluntary enlistment and in favor of conscription, including his compliant Chief of Staff, General George C. Marshall. And Marshall's new superior, Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, probably earned first place in the hysteria steeplechase in August 1940 when he claimed the country was in grave danger of invasion by the German armies while stubbornly holding out for conscription of "the whole manpower of the United States from 18 to 64." But early in August the Senate committee in its *seventh* draft of the bill sharply cut the total number of possible registerees. Roosevelt himself was extremely wary about making a *public* statement in support of conscription, knowing what political dynamite it was, though he did issue a mild endorsement of "selective training" 2 August. The bill was supposed to be reported for a vote on 5 August. It was delayed until the 9th, and then it was announced that more hearings would be held instead. On the 14th, the Senate was considered to be about equally divided on the bill's merits, after a 3-hour speech the previous day by Sen. Wheeler, in which he once more applied a satirical approach to the pro-draft propagandists, remarking that if conscription was the "democratic" way, then Stalinist Russia and Hitlerite Germany were the great exemplars of "democracy," in view of their conscription programs. Sen. Taft also continued his vigorous vocal opposition.

Part of the reason for the Senate's wariness on the Burke-Wadsworth bill was the knowledge that the big labor union federations, the AFL and CIO, as well as the railroad brotherhoods, were against it, as well as the farmers' unions,

and many millions of religiously-affiliated, especially among the Catholics and the Baptists. The misleading aspect of the pro-draft propaganda was the attitude reflected in about half the newspapers, and the two main public opinion polls, which neglected to tell the U.S. public that the French, with 6,000,000 conscripts under arms in the spring of this very year, had been defeated in a few weeks by a small collection of about a hundred thousand German military specialists. But big ideas of national regimentation were loose, partially documented favorably by two Dartmouth College professors, Harold J. Tobin and Percy W. Bidwell, in their just-published book *Mobilizing Civilian America*, issued by the Council on Foreign Relations; the pro-universal service people did not wish to be distracted by adverse facts.

At the end of August, the Senate by only two votes defeated the Maloney amendment, which would have put off the draft act consideration until 1941, but a similar amendment proposed by Hamilton Fish passed in the House by 30 votes on 5 September. Eventually a compromise amendment was agreed upon, limiting the service of those conscripted under this bill to one year, and confining the period of service to the Western Hemisphere, and to U.S. possessions and territories which might be elsewhere.

Senator Edwin C. Johnson, on the floor of the Senate on 27 August, remarked that the Burke-Wadsworth bill was "an excellent device for procuring 'cannon fodder' " which expanded in a different dimension on his previous denunciation of the draft as "political militarism," "American democracy's enemy No. 1" (see A.A. Ekirch, Jr., *The Civilian and the Military* (1955, repr. 1972). But the bitter fight in the Congress ended a few days later, with the House voting 233-124 and the Senate 47-25 for the much-amended and changed Selective Service bill. Undoubtedly a sizeable number of these people voted against the wishes of a plurality of their constituents at home in doing so.

Roosevelt signed the bill on 16 September and a month later there began the first peacetime registration of the country's men between the ages of 21 and 35, a far more restricted range than the ancient warriors like Secretary of War Stimson preferred and advocated. Those who registered, as skeptical and incredulous at the false alarms of

imminent national peril and the hyperthyroid hysteria of the Administration's mouthpieces as they were to be 40 years later, did in the main comply, but entirely without enthusiasm. The Boston *Herald* on 16 October 1940 burbled over the registration as a "triumph of deliberate democratic procedure," and praised the "far-sighted Grenville Clark of New York" as the author of the conscription law. "The response of free men," oozed *Time*; but in view of the fierce penalties for defying the draft act, compliance was anything but.

Somewhat more bogus was Congress' prompt gesture of "conscripting industry," a hasty action intended to tax the "windfall profits" (where have we heard that line recently?) of the many armament manufacturers and the allied firms making products going into the gigantic "defense" effort. This was especially denounced by Sens. La Follette and Vandenberg. But it was a sop thrown to the parents of the coming draftees, seeking to comfort them that their sons would not be bearing the burden of "defense" alone.

Despite the feverish and hectic promotional hectoring of the likes of Secretary of War Stimson, for example, aided by others of the same class of exponents for conscription for past decades (Stimson was a strenuous advocate of it dating back to 1916), the operational aspect got started with all the speed of one wading through a pool of partially frozen molasses. There simply did not exist the training facilities for a large conscript army, and the arms available even to practice at soldiering were pathetic in quality and quantity. *Life* magazine for 9 December 1940 observed that the first draft call brought about the summoning of only 18,700 men, hardly the myriads the hysterical proponents believed we needed six months before.

Furthermore, the failure of the re-elected Roosevelt after November 1940 to embroil the country any deeper in the European or the Pacific War led to a long season of plodding and stumbling on the home front, much of it communicated to the conscript army, which looked forward to the termination of their year of service. Panic again swept the interventionist fold, and a new drive to extend the draft built up in the summer of 1941. The most visible of those

arguing for this was the Chief of Staff, Gen. Marshall, who appeared over and over again to testify before Congress on the need to keep the draftees beyond the original stipulated period of service. The mood in the army camps grew tense, and threats of a mass desertion proliferated. The ominous acronym OHIO (Over the Hill in October) began to appear chalked on barracks walls, and a serious crisis was in full bloom by the time a galled and pressure-wracked House of Representatives voted, on 12 August 1941, by the majestic majority of just *one*, 203-202, to extend the period of service. There were 182 Democrats and 21 Republicans who voted for, 65 Democrats, 133 Republicans and 4 others voting against.

There is no doubt this close vote had a very sobering effect on the Administration, which frankly conceded several days before the final vote that they had a good chance of losing. But again it was pulled off by the same little group of Eastern power-brokers who had instigated the changes in the two American neutrality laws, started the campaign to elect Wendell Willkie (whose foreign policy was indistinguishable from Roosevelt's) and set up the two major committees which worked to get the U.S.A. involved in the European war. And Stimson was the symbolic figure of the whole campaign. (Senators Nye and Hiram Johnson had vociferously opposed the replacement of Secretary of War Harry Woodring with Stimson in July, and all August had charged the draft would become a real menace to American liberties with Stimson's arrival to this fateful post in the War Department.)

Roosevelt signed the draft extension bill on 18 August 1941, fully aware of the grave and dramatic split which had occurred in the country. But ten weeks later it was all washed out by the fortuitous attack on Pearl Harbor by the Japanese on 7 December 1941, an event which was known in a variety of ways to be coming, even though it became a rigid Administration position that it was utterly unexpected, posing as innocents set upon in a treacherous fashion. (There has long been a large literature which punches scores of big holes in this posture.) The attack on Hawaii was undoubtedly the most incredible windfall that ever befell any political regime in U.S. history, far exceeding the

Confederate attack on Fort Sumter in 1861 or the preludes to U.S. involvement in war in 1898 and 1917 as an assist in propelling onward a war-bound administration.

The immoderate administration of conscription was the primary cause of grave manpower and material shortage in the U.S. wartime economy, every draftee removed from the labor force being accompanied by two other men diverted into war instead of domestic production to keep him supplied. Some 14,000,000 ended up inducted into military and naval service, 1941-1945, 6,000,000 of whom never left continental United States, while many of the total drafted never were trained for what they were expected to do. The armed forces could have got along with half of this 14,000,000 total, thus in reality adding some 22,000,000 to the constructive economic labor force (7 million plus another 15 million whose work in war-related enterprises was a direct consequence of this bloated conscription program.) But war and the entire grandiose conscription epic brought to an end a previously insoluble unemployment problem, and the lesson was not lost on subsequent administrations, which have off and on used the American armed forces as a glorified social welfare agency.

Conscription also accompanied a season of wars and American military expansion all around the world involving many scores of bases whose staffing took the issue off the agenda in the U.S.A. for over a generation. Suspended for a brief interlude recently, the subject is making a strong attempt to return to its decades of institutionalized status between the '40s and the '70s. But it will need a far more persuasive promotion than it has recently been getting to insure anything of that nature. Whatever may be the state of world tensions, the events of the last dozen years in particular do not provide a very compelling backdrop for a new appeal to submit to universal selective service in the United States.

*The $957,000 bill was for the efforts of those of Clark's legal firm who had worked on the Paramount account, including himself. His was the most persuasive argument for the award of this fee, made before Judge Alfred C. Coxe. *New York Times*, July 19, 1935, p. 12. The court eventually adjusted the final charge slightly downward.

On the Uses of History

WILLIS A. CARTO

(*Presented at the 1981 Revisionist Conference*)

I suppose that one can become rather pessimistic and discouraged at the way the objective truth is distorted and hidden for the purposes of political and economic interests, but there is a profound lesson to be learned from the fact that it is, and there is no reason for discouragement if we learn from the muse of History how she has been persecuted and kicked around during her eternal life.

Distortion of history, when taken in a historical context, is certainly not a new or even a recent phenomenon; it is as old as language itself. As Spengler and Yockey and many others make very clear, there is no definite border and never has been between history-as-fact and history-as-myth. Indeed, where one stops and the other begins is quite impossible to determine in most cases.

Today, it is easy for us to believe, as 20th Century Americans, that the islands of Japan were not really formed by drops from the sword of the sun god, but note this: we are far more likely to reject this belief not because it is inherently preposterous but because it is Japanese and we are not.

In other words, it is our culture which conditions our minds to accept or reject facts as either history or as myth, and for the most part not the objective facts themselves, and if you have any difficulty with this concept think on the discovery of the golden tablets by Joseph Smith, the miracle of Fatima or even the virgin birth of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. As Christians, we have our share of historical facts which are open to doubt by others.

In the light of the needs of culture, we can plainly see that history-as-myth is not necessarily an evil in itself. The historical purpose of culture is to provide unity to a people, for with unity comes stability, order and perhaps progress. It is essential for a people to agree on an interpretation of the past, and the interpretation obviously must denote them as admirable, not despicable; superior, not inferior; noble and courageous, not ignoble and cowardly. History must be the mirror image of oneself. When it is not, it has been distorted. Thus, from the twin needs of having a history and making it a good one, myths are born. It is a process as ancient as language itself.

So we can see that historical distortion grows out of the needs of culture itself. We can perhaps excuse the Japanese myth of the origin of Japan as a harmless tale and one which—in conjunction with a whole panopoly of other myths—formed the basis for the development of the Japanese people and the flowering of one of the world's magnificent cultures. For better or worse, Japanese historical myths helped create Japan, just as Christian and Jewish myths helped create the Europe and the America we know. The point is, we must judge historical myth by judging its historical products, not by its content of objective fact. Which is another way of saying that historical lies are the norm.

Now that we have made that point, please note that we have not said, and we do not say that lies in themselves are all that is found in history. What we find is a mixture of lie and fact. For example, we know the objective fact that Abraham Lincoln is dead. To look a little closer we have reason to believe that he was shot at close range in Ford's Theatre on the night of April 14, 1865 by John Wilkes Booth. This much we know. We think.

It is what we don't know that concerns revisionist scholars. The orthodox interpretation of this event is that Booth was an unreconstructed Southerner who avenged the defeat of the Confederacy. Perhaps this is so, but there has been a century of speculation as to who else may have been involved and—most important of all—what the real motive may have been, if indeed there was another motive other than Booth's uncomplicated hatred.

For the purpose of democracy, it is well that Booth remain a "lone assassin"—and you have heard that phrase before. Thus, a more pointed interpretation of the deed does not excite much interest in the Establishment, other than permitting idle speculation that Booth was not killed by his pursuers but lived out his life robbing trains under the pseudonym of Jesse James.

Now it is not really significant to our destiny whether Jesse James was or was not John Wilkes Booth. Such trivia makes good books and movies and story-telling because it is meant to amuse rather than instruct. The question enters into the mythical, and

on the harmless side of the ledger, for myths may be either harmful or harmless or even beneficial. The question of Booth's true identity is the sort of specious issue useful to amuse Hollywood producers, cartoonists and Establishment historians but it is totally without significance when we consider the more weighty motives which may have figured in the event.

It has been whispered for many years that the Lincoln assassination resulted in profits of billions to bankers who were determined that Lincoln's wartime issuance of Greenbacks—paper money issued by the government at the cost of no interest to the taxpayers rather than banknotes issued by private banks at interest—be not made into a national habit—a habit which would have cost the bankers not only in terms of monetary profit but their control of government economic and political policy. I say "whispered" because the quantity of books which ask questions like these, in comparison to the volume of books which fail to ask such questions, thanks to establishment prejudice, is infinitesimal.

Now here is the point to all this. An interpretation of history which gives proper weight to the *sub-rosa* role of the bankers in public affairs is completely imcompatible with our present so-called "democratic" system, which is, in its essence, simply the rule of a consensus of minority, special-interest pressure groups, certainly not rule of the people, by the people and for the people, and the bankers play a central role in this coalition. Thus, the "lone assassin" myth fits democracy and the "conspiracy" or "banker" myth fits populism, but we may never know which interpretation is the objective truth, or if there is some other interpretation which is the objective truth. For example, in the eyes of abolitionist, or "liberal" Republicans, Lincoln was an obstacle to Reconstruction. In the eyes of communists, the assassination of Lincoln was perhaps the work of Northern industrialists who saw Lincoln as an obstacle to their plan of lowering the wages of the workers. The uses of history are endless.

The most pervasive and harmful myth today, of course, is that of the so-called "Holocaust," and all of its attendant fables. Thanks to the research of a small number of very courageous men who have literally risked their careers and their lives to document the truth, our insight not merely into World War II, its causes, its events and its outcome has been enhanced but more: our *weltanschauung* of today stands in stark variance to the world view of others not so enlightened as we. The Holocaust Myth has benefited its propagators as has few lies in history. We taxpayers in Western nations have shipped untold billions to Israel because of this myth. The myth-makers have profited but not those who have been and are being victimized by it. Aside from the monetary burden, an even more important problem is

the pervasive danger of nuclear war, because we are militarily involved in the Mideast only to protect Israel. Perhaps in this illustration we can see how lies cause war, because the guilt for a nuclear conflict in the Mideast will fall exclusively on those who are at this time profiting from their lie of the "Holocaust."

How does the Institute for Historical Review fit into this scenario? Our place is certain. There is a vacuum in historical scholarship which needs to be filled and this is what we are doing. We see history as part of our Western culture, not as a political weapon for minority zealots, not as a rallying cry for ambitious politicians, armament manufacturers and warmongers, nor from an ivory tower—a segregated, disjointed compartment of arcane knowledge. We are here to see that those who wish to use history to serve their own selfish ends are put down by scholarly research, for we believe that the best, the most useful and most permanent historical myths are founded on facts, not lies.

As Revisionists, we clearly perceive how our work is of absolutely fundamental importance. The lies of the past are rapidly turning our world into a jungle, even as our scientists and technicians are opening up an infinitely expanded world of possibility. The gulf between our corrupt and putrefying Establishment and our physical science now measures in light years, and the speed they are receding from each other is increasing. But it is this which gives us the promise and the certainty that the future holds unconditional victory for us, because in the war between a corrupt and dying social system system and technology, technology must inevitably win. The dying of diseased and retarded social systems are the very stuff of history; it has happened a thousand times; whereas the momentum of technological progress is now so powerful, so irrestible that nothing can contain it.

In this sense, we Revisionists are doing far more than merely "setting the past aright," as they say; we are doing more than serving as straight men for the media; more than physically defending the First Amendment with our bodies; more than educating the educationists; even more than just telling the truth. We are literally building a foundation of fact for the future—a future which will be based on constructive, not destructive myths; on a body of morality and social mores and constraints based on what is good for the people of the West rather than what is good for minority pressure groups, bankers, distortionist ideologies or alien interests.

The uses of history are many and various. Our job, as I understand it, is to see that it is used responsibly and constructively.

Declaration of Mark Edward Weber

Introduction

On October 9, 1981, California Superior Court Judge Thomas. T. Johnson, took "judicial notice" of the fact that "Jews were gassed to death at Auschwitz concentration Camp in Poland during the summer of 1944." Johnson's ruling was made in response to a Motion for "Judicial Notice" that had been made by plaintiff Mel Mermelstein in his law suit against the Institute for Historical Review.[1] Normally, parties to a legal dispute are permitted to introduce factual evidence to support their respective claims within the guidelines of evidentiary rules, which in California have been codified by the State legislature as the *California Evidence Code*. However, in order to avoid wasting the time of the court in proving the "obvious," the doctrine of the "judicial notice" has been developed whereby certain matters can be assumed to be factually true by the court and, thus, do not have to be proven through the introduction of evidence. In other words, where judicial notice is taken, no evidence needs to be introduced to prove the existence of the fact in question.[2]

In California, the doctrine of "permissive" judicial notice is set forth in *Evidence Code* §452 which states that:

"Judicial notice may be taken of the following matters. . .:

"(h) Facts and propositions that are not reasonably subject to dispute and are capable of immediate and accurate determination by resort to sources of reasonably indisputable accuracy."

As the language of *Evidence Code* §452(h) suggests, a fact may be judicially noticed only if it is not reasonably subject to dispute, and is capable of immediate and accurate verification by re-

sorting to an authority of indisputable accuracy.

In an attempt to convince Judge Johnson that the contention of Mr. Mermelstein that Jews were gassed at Auschwitz is both "disputable" and is not subject to "immediate verification" by resorting to sources of reasonably indisputable accuracy, the IHR asked Mark Edward Weber, an author and historical researcher, to summarize, in the form of a declaration, the historical controversy that surrounds the alleged Jewish genocide during World War II. That declaration, which was filed in the Superior Court for consideration by Judge Johnson, is reproduced below. In spite of the efforts of Mr. Weber, Judge Johnson granted Mermelstein's motion; he was pursuaded to do so, not because of any of the material which Mr. Mermelstein had submitted in support of his position, but rather due to certain unspecified "sources of reasonably indisputable fact." When asked by Richard Fusilier, the attorney representing the IHR, to name those sources, Johnson refused to do so and merely said, "Any number of sources. Many books. Sources of reasonably indisputable accuracy." This refusal of Judge Johnson to specify the source of the information upon which he based his ruling is, of itself, an abuse of judicial discretion. According to *Evidence Code* §455, if a judge resorts to any source of information that has not been received in open court in connection with the taking of judicial notice of any matter, that judge must, before he may take judicial notice, make such information and its source a part of the record in the action and must afford each party a reasonable opportunity to dispute such information.

A reading of Mr. Weber's declaration clearly demonstrates that the genocide claims of Mr. Mermelstein are hardly "indisputable" and are certainly not subject to "immediate and accurate verification" by resort to sources of reasonably indisputable accuracy. As a consequence, those facts cannot be judicially noticed.[3] In view of this conclusion, one is justified in wondering exactly what evidence influenced Judge Johnson and persuaded him to rule as he did. Mr. Fusilier speculated that his ruling was a "political" decision that had no evidentiary basis. If so, Judge Johnson's ruling is a chilling reminder of George Orwell's novel, *1984*, where history is constantly rewritten to satisfy contemporary political demands. After all, here is a judge who has put historical truth into the "memory hole" and has established new history by judicial fiat.

The Publisher

The Declaration

My name is Mark Weber. I was born in Portland, Oregon, and now reside in the Washington, D.C., area where I work as a writer, historical researcher and translator. I studied at Portland State University, the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, the University of Munich, and Indiana University. During the two and a half years I lived and studied in Germany, I became very familiar with the German language. In 1976, I graduated with high honors with a B.A. from Portland State University. I received a Master's degree in Central European history in 1977 from Indiana University, where I also served as an instructor.

My special field of competence is modern European history. For the past two and a half years I have been deeply involved in a careful study of the history of the Jews of Europe during the Second World War, and I am currently working on a book on this subject.

I was asked to carefully examine the material submitted by the attorney for Mr. Melvin Mermelstein in support of plaintiff's request that the court take judicial notice of the contention that Jews were killed by gassing at Auschwitz during the Second World War. On the basis of a careful examination of this material, and on the basis of my own specialized study of the history of the Jews during the Second World War, I firmly believe that sufficient grounds do **not** exist to have the court take judicial notice of the contention that Jews were killed by gassing at Auschwitz.

Counsel for plaintiff attempts, by presenting an extensive collection of material taken from published sources and unpublished statements by individuals, to convince the court that the proposition that Jews were killed by gassing at Auschwitz during the Second World War is an obvious historical fact worthy of judicial notice.

A proposition cannot be proven merely by assembling an extensive collection of material in its support. The character of the evidence is decisive, not its magnitude. The evidence must be reliable, self-consistent and accurate.

For example, numerous affidavits and statements from "eyewitnesses," as well as extensive published material from books could be presented in support of the proposition that "flying saucers" piloted by alien beings from other planets have landed on earth, and that humans have communicated and traveled with the aliens. But such evidence, while very extensive, would not be sufficient to have a court take judicial notice of the existence of "flying saucers."

Judicial notice may be taken of a proposition that is so universally known that it cannot reasonably be the subject of dispute. (Evid. Code Sec. 451(h).)

Various scholars who have carefully examined the matter have concluded that no Jews were ever gassed at Auschwitz. As I will show, the evidence for gassings submitted by plaintiff in support of its proposition is unreliable, contradictory and, in some cases, demonstrably false. The contention that Jews were gassed at Auschwitz may reasonably be considered subject to dispute.

The argument over whether Jews were gassed at Auschwitz may have political implications. But the debate among scholars over this question in not political. That is, all political views are represented on both sides of the controversy. It is completely incorrect to characterize all those who dispute the gassing claims as "neo-Nazis."

In 1948, the French history teacher Paul Rassinier published the first of his six books challenging the standard view of the "holocaust." He was a pacifist and a socialist who was arrested by the Gestapo in German-occupied France for helping to smuggle Jews into neutral Switzerland. Rassinier was incarcerated for almost two years at the concentration camps of Buchenwald and Dora. After the war, he was elected to the French National Assembly and decorated for his resistance activities.

Another noted "revisionist" was the eminent American historian, Harry Elmer Barnes, a man who detested political collectivism of any kind. In France today, the most active and vocal challengers of the orthodox view of the "holocaust" are affiliated with a Marxist-libertarian literary group.

The argument about whether Jews were gassed at Auschwitz transcends political affiliations. In America as well as Europe, respected scholars have taken reasoned exception to the standard version of "holocaust" history. This is not unusual. Historians frequently disagree sharply among themselves about aspects of history. Widely accepted historical "facts" often later turn out to be rather less than that.

Down through the ages, official bodies making pronouncements about "historical facts" have forced scholars holding unorthodox views to recant.

In 1543, Nicholas Copernicus published his famous work which declared that the earth revolved around the sun. The Catholic Church suppressed the work for centuries because it contradicted the official view that the earth is the center of the universe. In 1633, Galileo was jailed after being forced by the Inquisition to abjure his declaration that the sun is the center of the planetary system. In 1925, John T. Scopes was fined by a court in Tennessee for teaching the Darwinian theory of evolution in a public school

because it conflicted with the Biblical version of the origin of life. Today, in the Soviet Union, Poland, and other countries subordinate to the USSR, it is forbidden to state publicly that thousands of Polish officers were murdered by Soviet officials at Katyn in 1940.

Many countries, notably the communist states, oblige historians to conform to an official version of history. In our country, we have a long tradition of freedom of intellectual expression based on the notion that truth does not require judicial or official protection from challengers. Indeed, we Americans are proud of the fact that we tolerate and encourage diverse alternative and even controversial interpretations of history. To have a court take judicial notice of the disputed contention that Jews were gassed at Auschwitz would be an irresponsible violation of our tradition of intellectual freedom

Not just the "gas chamber" issue, but the whole question of what actually happened to the Jews of Europe during the Second World War is the subject of growing controversy and dispute. In Germany, that debate became more intense following the appearance in 1978 of a massive 760-page work entitled *Geschichte der Deutschen* (History of the Germans), published by the prestigious Propylaeen publishing house.

The author, Dr. Helmut Diwald, had already made a name for himself as an eminent and highly respected senior professor of history at the University of Erlangen. His earlier works had been praised as well-written products of solid, scholastic workmanship. The fact that a man of Dr. Diwald's stature would challenge the standard version of "holocaust" historiography is especially significant.

The section of his book headed "The Final Solution" is worth quoting at length. (pp164-165 of the first edition.):

> Ever since the charge was made that the SS attempted to physically annihilate the Jews of Europe, under orders from Hitler and as directed by Himmler and the Reich Security Main Office, the problem of "Auschwitz" has been completely blacked out. Since the capitulation in 1945, "Auschwitz" has also served as the main vehicle in a campaign to reduce the German people to complete moral degradation.
>
> . . . Countless works have been published and claims made since 1945 which cannot be proven and which cynically add to the infamy. The most horrible events of modern times have been exploited through the use of distortions, deceptions and exaggerations for the purpose of totally disqualifying a people.
>
> Thus, the victorious Allies claimed the existence of "extermination camps" of which there was not a single one in Germany. For years visitors to the Dachau concentration camp were shown "gas

chambers" where as many as 25,000 Jews were allegedly killed daily by the SS. Actually, the rooms displayed were dummy chambers which the U.S. military had forced imprisoned SS men to build after the capitulation. A similar case involved the notorious Bergen-Belsen concentration camp, where 50,000 inmates were supposedly murdered. Actually, about 7,000 inmates died during the period when the camp existed, from 1943 to 1945. Most of them died in the last months of the war as a result of disease and malnutrition—consequences of the bombings which had completely disrupted normal deliveries of medical supplies and food. The British commander who took control of the camp after the capitulation testified that crimes on a large scale had not taken place at Bergen-Belsen.

The deportation of the Jews took place as part of a general forced-labor program for the war industry. After the beginning of the war against Russia, the German war economy grew from month to month and reached a high point in mid-1942. All those who could work at all were inducted, including the Jews. In accordance with their special status, they were subject to especially inhumane treatment. The enormous program for their deportation by railway from all the occupied territories for use in Eastern munitions factories and work camps was justified by the military importance of their tasks and received top priority, even ahead of army transport.

Auschwitz, an old industrial town on the upper Silesian plateau, developed into a major wartime production center. The chemical industry quickly became far more important than the older zinc rolling mills and grinding works. The most significant aspect was the production of artificial rubber and petroleum from coal. On 16 February 1942, all concentration camps were incorporated into the war economy and munitions industry and accordingly came under the organizational authority of the SS Main Office for Economic Administration and its chief, General Otto Pohl.

The various camps were classified according to their importance to the war economy. Birkenau, a part of the Auschwitz complex, served as the camp for those inmates who were declared unsuited for work. Consequently, the camp had the highest death rate. On 26 July 1942, a devastating typhus epidemic broke out in Birkenau. As many as 20,000 died within three months.

That is why an especially large number of crematoria for burning the bodies were built in Birkenau. Reports of the high death rate there moved Himmler to issue an order on 28 December 1942 "to reduce the number of deaths in the concentration camps at all costs."

During the war Jewish emigration was no longer possible and the expression "total solution" or "final solution" was coined to refer to the policy whereby all Jews were to be segregated from the German population, removed from central Europe, evacuated to the East, and relocated in new ghettos. This plan was outlined by

Reinhard Heydrich, chief of the Reich Security Main Office on 24 June 1940. The central questions about what actually happened in the subsequent years still remain unclear despite all of the literature. "Auschwitz" is the German stigma of this century.

At the famous Nuremberg trials of the "International Military Tribunal" (IMT), impressive eivdence was presented for the existence and operation of gas chambers at the concentration camps of Dachau and Ravensbrueck. A lengthy U.S. government report was accepted as IMT document L-159 (also known as 222-USA) which described how inmates at the Dachau camp were killed by gassing. (Document L-159 can be found in the International Military Tribunal "Blue Series", Vol. XXXVII, pp-605-626.)

Mme. Marie-Claude Vaillant-Couturier, a French communist, testified at the Nuremberg trials about the killing of inmates in gas chambers at the Ravensbrueck concentration camp. (This "evewitness" testimony can be found in the IMT "Blue Series," Vol. VI, pp224-225.) These are only two examples of many others that could be cited of legally binding "eyewitness" and "official" evidence for the existence and operation of gas chambers in Germany that helped convict and hang German defendants at the Nuremberg trials.

Simon Wiesenthal, the famous "Nazi hunter" admitted in a letter to the respected British periodical *Books & Bookmen* (April 1975, p5) that "there were no extermination camps on German soil. . ." Martin Broszat, Director of the Institute for History in Munich, stated in a letter to the German weekly newspaper *Die zeit* (19 August 1960, p16) that there had never been any gassings anywhere in the "old Reich," that is, Germany in its boundaries of 1937. The statements from these two men are cited here because each of them was called upon by plaintiff to provide written statements in this case. (Plaintiff Attachments Nos. 1 and 5). Similar statements could be produced from others whose sympathies are likewise entirely with the plaintiff. These admissions are important because they discredit the many "testimonies" of "eyewitnesses" which were cited for many years to "prove" that concentration camp inmates were killed in gas chambers at various camps in Germany proper, such as Dachau, Ravensbrueck, Buchenwald, Neuengamme, Oranienburg, and others.

For obvious reasons, the statements quoted above by Broszat and Wiesenthal have not been made widely known. That's because evidence for the existence of lethal gas chambers at Auschwitz is no more substantial than the evidence for gas chambers at camps where even Broszat, Wiesenthal and others now admit there were none. In the case of Auschwitz, as well as in the cases

of Dachau, Ravensbrueck, and so forth, the evidence that Jews were killed by gassing consists almost exclusively of "testimony" from "eyewitnesses." How is it that we are now expected to dismiss the "proofs" of gassings at camps in Germany proper as invalid while continuing to accept equally dubious "proofs" for gassings at Auschwitz?

An objective person would be justified in dismissing the claim for gassings at Auschwitz because they are just as baseless as those for camps where we now know that no gassings took place. Clearly, the claim that Jews were gassed at Auschwitz may reasonably be considered subject to dispute. A court would even be justified in stating that the claim that Jews were gassed at Auschwitz is questionable and dubious.

Attachment No. 5 submitted by the plaintiff consists of pages from the book *KL Auschwitz Seen by the SS*. From the section of the book taken from the diary of Johann Paul Kremer ("Diary of Kremer") plaintiff has submitted only a single sheet consisting of pages 212 and 213. On these two pages, there is only a single entry from Dr. Kremer's diary which could at all even be construed as referring to killings. That is the four line entry of 2 september 1942.

The entry, as submitted by the plaintiff, reads as follows:

> Was present for first time at a special action at 3 a.m. By comparison Dante's Inferno seems almost a comedy. Auschwitz is justly called an extermination camp.

As written in the original German, the entry reads:

> Zum 1. Male draussen um 3 Uhr frueh bei einer Sonderaktion zugegen. Im Vergleich hierzu erscheint mir das Dante'sche Inferno fast wie eine Komoedie. Umsonst wird Auschwitz nicht das Lager der Vernichtung genannt!

The correct translation of this entry should thus be:

> This morning, at 3 o'clock, I was present outside for the first time at a special action. Compared to that, Dante's Inferno appears to me almost like a comedy. It is not without reason that Auschwitz is called the camp of the annihilation.

The original text is mistranslated and presented in such a way as to distort its original meaning. Dr. Kremer is not referring here to killing people by gassing. He is referring to an emergency assignment he was called to make in his capacity as a medical doctor to treat victims of disease. This becomes clear to anyone who carefully examines and studies the original diary. A detailed analysis is not possible here. However, the following quotation from a letter written by Dr. Kremer on 21 October 1942 to a Miss Glaser shows that when Kremer refers to Auschwitz as an in-

ferno or a "hell" he means that the outbreak of disease has created hellish conditions on the camp:

> I don't really know for certain, but I expect, however, that I'll be able to be in Muenster before 1 December, and thus finally turn my back on this hell of Auschwitz where, in addition to the typhoid, and so on, typhus has once again broken out strongly...

The plaintiff submits testimony by Rudolf Hoess, a former Auschwitz commandant, as evidence for gassings at Auschwitz. (*KL Auschwitz Seen by the SS, "Autobiography of Hoess,"* pp-132-136, Plaintiff Attachment No. 5). This testimony is probably the single most important piece of evidence for gassings at Auschwitz. It is widely quoted or cited in secondary historical books on the subject.

Actually, statements by Hoess are notoriously unreliable. A good example is the Hoess affidavit of 5 April 1946 (Nuremberg document 3868-PS). Hoess claims that three million persons died at Auschwitz, an absurd figure that no responsible historian accepts today. He claims that mass executions by gassing began in the summer of 1941, another absolutely absurd statement. He claims that, besides Auschwitz, "Belzec," "Treblinka," and "Wolzek" were extermination camps. Actually, no camp named "Wolzek" ever existed.

In his book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (pp100-124), Dr. Arthur Butz examines the Hoess affidavit of 5 April 1946 in great detail and carefully evaluates the testimony of Hoess, including the famous "Autobiography"in its relation to the gassing allegations. These pages are appended to this statement as Attachment No. 9.

The "Autobiography" cited by plaintiff was supposedly written while Hoess was a prisoner in communist-ruled Poland shortly before his execution. There is no way of determining the genuineness of the "Autobiography"although communist practice should compel any objective person to view the memoir with extreme skepticism.

A careful examination of the material submitted by plaintiff reveals serious contradictions in the details of plaintiff's claim. Consider, for example, these contradictory descriptions of the condition of the bodies of Auschwitz gassing victims immediately following the opening of the gas chamber doors.

From the "Autobiography of Hoess" in *KL Auschwitz Seen by the SS*, page 134 (Plaintiff Attachment No. 5):

> The door was opened half an hour after the induction of the gas, and the ventilation switched on. Work was immediately begun on removing the corpses. There was no noticeable change in the bodies and no sign of convulsions or discoloration. Only after the

> bodies had been lying for some time, that is to say after several hours, did the usual death stains appear in the places where they had lain. Soiling through the opening of the bowels was also rare. There were no signs of wounding of any kind. The faces showed no distortion.

From *Auschwitz: Nazi Extermination Camp*, published in 1978 by Interpress, Warsaw, p114. (Plaintiff Attachment No. 9):

> Most of the corpses were found near the door through which the victims had tried to escape from the spreading gas. The corpses, which covered the entire floor of the chamber, had their knees half-bent, and were often cloven together. The bodies were smeared with excrement, vomit and blood. The skin assumed a pink hue.

Attachment No. 7 submitted by plaintiff is likewise unreliable and inaccurate. This attachment consists of pages copied from the book *The Crime and Punishment of I.G. Farben* by Joseph Borkin. On page 126, for example, it is alleged that human fat from the corpses of Jews killed at Auschwitz was made into soap by the Germans.

The story that the Germans used Jewish corpses to make soap has been widely circulated. It was officially accepted at the Nuremberg trials where many "documents" and "testimonies" were introduced to substantiate the allegation. What was all this "evidence" really worth? Although many Jewish survivors and writers still propogate the soap story, no resposible historian accepts the allegation today.

Alarmed at the growing skepticism about the "holocaust," a Jewish historian recently warned about the dangers in repeating "holocaust" stories that have long since been proven to be lies. Deborah Lipstadt, a teacher of modern Jewish history at the University of California at Los Angeles stated in a letter to the *Los Angeles Times* of 16 May 1981:

> The fact is that the Nazis never used the bodies of Jews, or for that matter anyone else, for the production of soap. The soap rumor was prevalent both during and after the war. It may have had its origin in the cadaver factory atrocity story that came out of World War I. . . . The soap rumor was thoroughly investigated after the war and proved to be untrue.

Actually, Deborah Lipstadt is not quite accurate. The soap rumor has never been "thoroughly investigated." To the contrary, the story was widely circulated as part of the official "historical verdict" of the Nuremberg trials. Once again, the "evidence" for gassing at Auschwitz is just as reliable as the "evidence" for the baseless allegation that the Germans used Jewish bodies to manufacture soap.

Plaintiff's submission of published material which repeats the soap story casts doubt on the reliability of the rest of the material submitted.

The plaintiff submits, as Attachment No. 11, many pages reproduced from *Le Memorial de la Deportation des Juifs de France* (The Memorial of the Deportation of the Jews of France) a book by Serge Klarsfeld published in Paris in 1978.

Of the pages submitted, 87 consist of lists of Jews deported from France to Eastern Europe during the Second World War. These pages list the deportees alphabetically by family name, first name, date of birth and place of birth. The impression is given that all of the many thousands of persons listed were killed according to a German policy of extermination. This impression is not accurate. The book merely provides a listing of Jews deported from France, not of Jews who died at Auschwitz or anywhere else during the Second World War.

A particulary prominent example will suffice to prove this. On page 519 of the *Memorial*, the following person is listed: Simone Jacob was one of 500 Jews—male and female—in rail convoy number 17 which left Drancy, France, on 13 April 1944.

To find out what happened to the deportees, one next consults the *Hefte von Auschwitz*, published by the State Museum of Auschwitz. As a Polish government instituttion, the State Museum of Auschwitz (Panstwowe Muzeum Oswiecim) is controlled by the Polish communist party. The plaintiff apparently has considerable confidence in this institution as a reliable authority. It published three of the books from which pages were submitted to the court by the plaintiff. [*Auschwitz 1940—1945*, Plaintiff Attachment No. 3; *KL Auschwitz Seen by the SS*, Plaintiff Attachment No. 5; and, *KZ Auschwitz: Reminiscenses of an SS Man*, Plaintiff Attachment No. 10)

According to the *Hefte von Auschwitz* (Nr. 7, 1964, p.88), the 165 men of the convoy were admitted to the Auschwitz camp as inmates and given registration numbers. All the others, including Simone Jacob, were allegedly gassed on 16 April 1944, the day of the convoy's arrival at the camp.

Today, Simone Jacob is well known by her married name of Simone Veil. The former French Minister of Health is now President of the European Parliament in Strasbourg. Thus, according to documentation considered reliable by the plaintiff, Simone Jacob (Veil) was another Jewish victim of the Auschwitz gas chambers. But she is very much alive today. One may ask: If the German policy was to exterminate Jews Deported from France, why wasn't 18-year-old Simon Jacob killed at Auschwitz?

The entire listing of Jews deported from France as given in the *Memorial* submitted by plaintiff in no way constitutes evidence of

plaintiff's claim that Jews were gassed at Auschwitz. The fact that Simone Veil is alive today is another indication of the unreliability of the evidence submitted by plaintiff to support his claim. The *Memorial* submitted by plaintiff is not merely irrelevant to this case, it serves to discredit his argument and lend support to the notion that plaintiff's claim may reasonably be considered the subject of dispute.

The plaintiff submits as Attachment No. 12 a notarized statement dated 4 May 1981 by Simon Wiesenthal. For some 25 years, Wiesenthal has managed the "Jewish Documentation Center" in Vienna. He is well known as a "Nazi hunter" because he has been instrumental in bringing many persons to trial for allegedly committing crimes against Jews during the Second World War. Although Wiesenthal is not a historian, one would expect that a man of his reputation would be reliable and accurate in stating facts for a court case dealing with the subject to which he has dedicted his life. Such, however, is not the case.

The statement by Simon Wiesenthal submitted by the plaintiff is confused, distorted and factually incorrect. The final paragraph of the statement reads:

> In a South African newspaper they maintained that Hitler didn't know about the killing of Jews and therefore it could not be reality. The Federation of Jewish Communities brought this matter before the court. Albert Speer, a former friend of Hitler and minister of his government made a statement for the court in Johannesburg. He declared under oath that Hitler often spoke about the murdering of Jews and that as far as he had known gasifications of Jews took place. Speer is a witness of Hitler's close environment. The trial against the newspaper had been won with the help of this testimony

This is a complete distortion of fact.

In June 1976, the South African Jewish Board of Deputies (not the "Federation of Jewish Communities") began legal action to have a booklet entitled *Did Six Million Really Die?* effectively banned. (Not something from "a South African newspaper.") The South African government acted favorably and declared the booklet "undesirable" which had the effect of prohibiting its further dissemination.

In preparation for a hearing before the South African Publications Appeal Board, the Jewish Board of Deputies obtained an affidavit dated 15 June 1977 from Albert Speer, former confidant of Adolf Hitler and wartime Reich Minister of Armaments. Contrary to what Wiesenthal states, it is not true that Speer "declared under oath that Hitler often spoke about the murdering of Jews and that as far as he knows gasifications of Jews took place." In point of fact, Speer repeatedly maintained that he

never had any first hand knowledge of any policy to kill the Jews of Europe.

Shortly after his recent death, the *Jewish Journal* (Brooklyn, N.Y. 11 September 1981, p4) noted in an obituary that Speer "always maintained that he did not know of the death camps in which six million Jews died." He also stated on many occasions that he never heard Hitler speak about any such plan or program. In a letter dated 6 May 1977 to Mr. Denis Diamond, Executive Director of the Jewish Board of Deputies, Speer stated specifically that ". . . I would give something for being able to state clearly that Hitler had ordered the killing of the Jews in my presence. Neither am I in the position to testify to the exact number of killed Jews."

Furthermore, in his memoirs, published in English under the title *Inside the Third Reich*, Speer nowhere states that he knew anything of any mass killing of Jews during the Second World War. This is particularly remarkable because Speer was in an excellent position to have known about such a policy if one had existed.

The inaccuracy and confusion of Simon Wisenthal's statement of 4 May 1981 is unfortunately all too typical of so much of the "evidence" for the alleged gassing of Jews during the Second World War. The Wiesenthal statement submitted by the plaintiff is demonstrably incorrect and false. It is itself evidence that plaintiff's claim of gassings at Auschwitz may reasonably be considered the subject of dispute and hence not suitable for judicial notice.

Despite the highly favorable image in the mass media, Simon Wiesenthal has proven himself unreliable even as a "Nazi hunter." A lengthy article copyrighted by the American Bar Association and published in the *Washington Post* (Sunday, 10 May 1981, ppB5, B8) revealed that Wiesenthal took part in a witchhunt against Frank Walus, a man falsely accused of helping the Germans murder Jews during the Second World War. The Walus case demonstrated not only the recklessness of Simon Wiesenthal but the general unreliability of the eyewitness "testimony" which constitutes the bulk of the "Holocaust" evidence.

The following is from the *Washington Post* article, entitled "The Nazi Who Never Was: How a witchhunt by judge, press and investigators branded an innocent man a war criminal":

> In January 1977, the United States government accused a Chicagoan named Frank Walus of having committed atrocities in Poland during World War II.
>
> In the following four years, this retired factory worker went into debt in order to raise more than $60,000 to defend himself. He sat in a courtroom while 11 Jewish survivors of the Nazi occupation of

> Poland testified that they saw him murder children, an old woman, a young woman, a hunchback and others. . . .
>
> Overwhelming evidence shows that Walus was not a Nazi war criminal, that he was not even in Poland during World War II.
>
> . . . In an atmosphere of hatred and loathing verging on hysteria, the government persecuted an innocent man.
>
> In 1974, Simon Wiesenthal, the famous "Nazi hunter" of Vienna, denounced Walus as "a Pole in Chicago who performed duties with the Gestapo in the ghettos of Czestochowa and Kielce and handed over a number of Jews to the Gestapo."
>
> Wiesenthal did not say on what basis he made this denunciation. He says that Michael Alper was not his source, but he will not name anyone else. Did he check on his source before he accused Walus? There is no evidence of it. No documents ever have been produced against Walus, and all of the witnesses against him were found after 1974.

The Chicago weekly newspaper *Reader* (23 January 1981) also reported on the case in a very extensive article headlined: "The Persecution of Frank Walus: To Catch a Nazi: The U.S. government wanted a war criminal. So, with the help of Simon Wiesenthal, the Israeli police, the local press and Judge Julius Hoffman, they invented one."

The article stated (pages 19 and 30):

> . . It is logical to assume that the "reports" received by Wiesenthal (against Walus) actually were rumors and that the rumors, though they may not have come directly from Alper, were started by Alper after Walus threw him out of the house in 1973.
>
> In other words, Simon Wiesenthal had no evidence against Walus. He denounced him anyway.
>
> While (Judge) Hoffman had the Walus case under advisement, *Holocaust* aired on television. During the same period, in April 1978, Simon Wiesenthal came to Chicago, where he gave interviews taking credit for the Walus case. "How Nazi-Hunter Helped Find Walus," was the *Sun-Times* headline on a story by Bob Olmstead. Wiesenthal told *Sun-Times* writer Abe Peck that he "has never had a case of mistaken identity." "I know there are thousands of people who wait for my mistake," he said.

Plaintiff submitted a copy of an article from the *Los Angeles Times* of 24 February 1979 ("Aerial Photos of Auschwitz Camp," pp1, 6) with two accompanying aerial photos of portions of the Auschwitz camp complex. (Plaintiff Attachment No. 21).

The most detailed presentation of the photos is available in a 19-page booklet published by the Central Intelligence Agency and prepared by two CIA employees, Dino A. Brugiono and Robert. G. Poirier. (*The Holocaust Revisited: A Retrospective Analysis of*

the Auschwitz-Birkenau Extermination Complex. ST 79-10001. Published in Washington, D.C. in 1979.)

The article submitted by the plaintiff does not reveal that all of the descriptive labels on the photos, including those which identify certain buildings as "gas chambers," were added to the photos more than thirty years after the end of the war by the CIA employees. The identification of buildings as "gas chambers" was not done on the basis of any evidence to be found in the photos themselves. Nothing in the photos gives any indication whatsoever that the buildings described as "gas chambers" were really such. Rather, the "identification" was made solely on the basis of post-war "evidence" or "testimony" of dubious reliability.

The aerial photos actually serve to discredit plaintiff's claim that Jews were gassed at Auschwitz. On these dates, Allied aircraft took aerial photos of the Auschwitz complex during the period when mass killing in the gas chambers was allegedly happening: 4 April, 26 July, 25 August, and 13 September, 1944,. And yet on none of the photos taken on random dates during this period can one find the slightest trace of evidence for a mass killing program. There are no large crowds of Jews destined for destruction, no smoke and flame billowing from the crematoria which were supposedly operating continuously, nor even the slightest trace of corpses and/or ashes. All of these should have been visible had any significant number of Jews been gassed and disposed of at Auschwitz. The CIA employees who first examined and presented these photos were admittedly somewhat disturbed about this fact. "Although survivors recalled that smoke and flame emanated continually from the crematoria chimneys and was visible for miles, the photography we examined gave no positive proof of this." (p11)

The aerial photos cast serious doubt on the claim that Jews were gassed at Auschwitz because what they reveal is so completely inconsistent with the "evidence" usually offered for the existence of an alleged gassing extermination process.

In conclusion, the material submitted by attorney for the plaintiff in support of the contention that Jews were killed by gassing at Auschwitz during the Second World War is unreliable, contradictory and, in some cases, demonstrably false. It is not compelling evidence. Indeed, the very evidence submitted by plaintiff casts doubt on the contention that Jews were gassed at Auschwitz. The aerial photos taken during 1944 and mentioned earlier are especially significant in this regard. Furthermore, the arguments and evidence brought forward by those who disagree with the contention that Jews were gassed at Auschwitz are reasonable and worthy of consideration. The contention That Jews were gassed at Auschwitz may reasonably be the subject of dispute.

I have appended to this statement nine attachments of material copied from various published sources.

Attachments

1. *The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1980, pp5-22, "The International 'Holocaust' Controversy" by Dr. Arthur R. Butz: pp23-30, "The Mechanics of Gassing" by Prof. Robert Faurisson.
2. *The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Summer 1980, pp103-114, "The 'Problem of the Gas Chambers'" by Prof. Robert Faurisson: pp115-119: "In the Matter of Robert Faurisson" by John Bennett.
3. *The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 1, No. 4, Winter 1980, pp323-334, "The Faurisson Affair" by Dr. Arthur Butz.
4. *The "Problem of the 'Gas Chambers'"* or *"The Rumor of Auschwitz"* by Prof. Robert Faurisson. Translation of various statements by Prof. Faurisson which appeared originally in the Paris daily newspaper *Le Monde*.
5. *Six Million Lost and Found*, by "Richard Harwood" (pseudonym), published in Britain (complete text).
6. *Auschwitz: A Personal Account*, by Thies Christophersen, Published in the United States in 1979.
7. *Verite historique ou verite politique*, (*Historical Truth or Political Truth*), by Serge Thion (and Robert Faurisson) Paris, La Vielle Taupe, 1980, pp25-36, An essay by Serge Thion on the historical development of the Auschwitz and "holocaust" legends: pp310-322, Analysis of photographs from Auschwitz, with explanations: p328, Auschwitz "gassing victim" Simone Veil is alive.
8. *Memoire en Defense* (*Memoir in Defense Against Those Who Accuse Me of Falsifying History—The Gas Chamber Question*), by Robert Faurisson (with preface by Noam Chomsky), Paris: La Vieille Taupe, 1980, pp147-167: Documentation on the "material impossibility of the Auschwitz 'gas chambers'."
9. *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, by Arthur R. Butz, Torrance, Calif, The Noontide Press, 1979, pp100-124, Examination of an affidavit of Rudolf Hoess.

Notes to the Introduction

1. *Mermelstein vs. Institute for Historical Review, et al.* No. C35642, Superior Court of California, in and for the County of Los Angeles.
2. Generally, judicial notice is taken of technical matters such as, for example, the temperature at which water boils or the life expectancy of an individual based upon standard actuarial tables.
3. The California Supreme Court in *Communist Party v. Peek* (1942), 20 Cal.2d 536, a leading case on the subject of the applicability of judicial notice, said, quoting from the earlier case of *Varcoe v. Lee*, 180 Cal. 344, that "if there were any possibility of dispute' the fact cannot be judicially noticed; and...'if there is doubt whatever as the fact itself...evidence should be required." (Pages 546-547)

Facts, Allegations and Judicial Notice

Submitted to the California Superior Court
in the Case, *Mermelstein vs. IHR et al.*, by

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

Introduction

The defendants in the above-entitled cause respectfully submit the following Points and Authorities, and the appended Declaration of Mark Edward Weber, in opposition to the Plaintiff's Request that Court take Judicial Notice of the fact that Jews were gassed at Auschwitz.

Argument

The question whether Jews were gassed at Auschwitz is not susceptible to judicial notice.

Judicial notice may not be taken of any matter unless authorized or required by law. Deering's *Annotated Evidence Code*, Section 450. This is true even though, to the judge, the fact may appear to be indisputable. *Varcoe v. Lee*, 180 C. 338, 181 P. 223 (Cal. 1919).

The California Evidence Code sets forth certain matters which must be or may be, judicially noticed. Section 451 (f) mandates judicial notice of facts and propositions of generalized knowledge that are so universally known that they cannot reasonably be the subject of dispute. Section 452 (h) permits judicial notice of facts and propositions that are not reasonably subject to dispute and are capable of immediate and accurate determination by resort to sources of reasonably indisputable accuracy.

It is commonly understood that judicial notice is not to be used to resolve the disputed issues of a case, but rather is a way of avoiding time-wasting and expense in the proof of matters which are so obvious and indisputable as to necessitate no proof. That the moon was full on a certain date, or that in California the sun is always higher in the sky at noon than at dawn, or that Napoleon Bonaparte once ruled France, are facts that fall in that

category. But the hazards of judicial notice are illustrated by the ease with which judges might at one time have taken judicial notice (to the great detriment of pioneering searchers for truth) that the earth is flat, that the earth does not orbit the sun, that the application of leeches is the best cure for fever, that humanity has existed for only a few thousand years, or that witches commonly cause the failure of crops and the drying of cows. Examples of this kind demonstrate that a debated issue, though most of the population stand on one side and only a tiny minority on the other, should not be resolved by judicial notice. This is particularly true where the treacherous shoals of "that huge Mississippi of falsehood called history" (Matthew Arnold) are concerned.

The alleged historical event which the plaintiff asks this Court to take judicial notice of is at this time heatedly disputed by a number of researchers. Those researchers substantiate their argument with objective evidence, as is amply shown in the Declaration of Mark Edward Weber annexed hereto. For example, although the plaintiff and some other inmates present at Auschwitz-Birkenau during the summer of 1944 state that the crematoria belched smoke and flames day and night during that period, Allied aerial photographs taken on various days during the same period show *nothing* issuing from those chimneys at any time.

In the deposition of Melvin Mermelstein, taken on May 27, 1981, the plaintiff states that he saw at Birkenau four chimneys spewing red flames (page 34); that he saw members of his family go into "gas chamber No. 5," where they were gassed and cremated (page 37); that he was 40 or 50 feet from the entrance to "the gas chambers" that his relatives entered (page 46); that gas chamber No. 5 was underground (page 47); and that there was one chimney on gas chamber No. 5 (pages 47 and 116). The plaintiff's claims are contradicted by a report (*The Holocaust Revisited: A Retrospective Analysis of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Extermination Complex* by Central Intelligence Agency Photo-analysts, Dino A. Brugioni and Robert G. Poirier) published in 1979 after the CIA turned over to the National Archives aerial reconnaissance photographs taken of Auschwitz-Birkenau between April 4, 1944 and January 14, 1945. (It should be noted that Brugioni and Poirier make the assumption, in no way warranted by the photographs they are analyzing, that gas chambers existed at Auschwitz-Birkenau; those who deny that there were any gas chambers maintain that the facilities in question were crematoria.)

On page 12 of *The Holocaust Revisited*, beneath a photograph of facilities 4 and 5, the author states:

> The imagery acquired on 13 September 1944 provides a unique view of Gas Chambers and Crematoria IV and V (Photo 7). Located among the trees of the "Birch Wood," *these facilities could not be seen by surviving prisoners in the camp.* They were of a different design than Gas Chambers I and II; *they had two rather than one chimney each,* and *were built totally above the ground rather than having underground sections.*
>
> (Emphasis added.)

The photographs reproduced in the CIA report show all four of the Birkenau crematoria (i.e. numbers 2 through 5) to be surrounded by fencing and landscaping which would have made it impossible for anyone outside the enclosed areas to watch people inside, as the plaintiff claims that he did for some two hours at dawn on May 22, 1944.

Such discrepancies between objective evidence and the plaintiff's claims should alone be sufficient to prevent the taking of judicial notice of the claim.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau rose to prominence by demonstrating in a great debate in Paris (1744) That the "falsifying of history had done more to retard than to advance human welfare." (Jennings Wise). All societies whether by design or error have their historical myths and misconceptions. The plaintiff is part of a movement to institutionalize and transform into sacrosanct dogma a version of history which a growing number of other people sincerely and seriously dispute. When the photo-analysts Brugioni and Poinier wrote about "gas chambers" it was because they accepted the popular version of history which the plaintiff wishes to perpetuate and were no doubt unaware that there was another side to the story. It was not because the aerial photographs themselves gave evidence of people being exterminated in gas chambers. On the contrary, during the days when the extermination process was supposed to be at its height, the pictures show no people at all in the vicinity of the "gas chambers," no lines of people on the neatly landscaped grounds of those chimneyed facilities, and never any smoke or flame issuing from those chimneys (four chimneys at Birkenau accordingly to the plaintiff, six according to photographic evidence). The only lines of people are in other parts of the camps—the registration area, for example. The original analysts of the same photographs during World War Two did not see gas chambers or an extermination camp at Auschwitz-Birkenau for the simple reason that the photographs themselves, viewed with an unbiased eye, give not even a hint of such terrible things. Viewed with an objective eye today, the same photographs are outstanding evidence that Auschwitz-Birkenau was not—contrary to the plaintiff's contention—a death factory, belching flames day and night as it

consumed millions of victims.

The defendants respectfully submit that the plaintiff is attempting to enlist the authority and prestige of this Court for the illegitimate purpose of placing its imprimatur on a version of past events which is currently under heavy and well-supported attack. To make the matter worse, the assertions on which the plaintiff asks the Court to take judicial notice are irrelevant to all imaginably viable issues of this lawsuit. (Defendants do not admit there are any issues which would stand in the way of a summary judgment in their favor.)

> The doctrine of judicial notice was adopted as a judicial shortcut to avoid necessity for the formal introduction of evidence in certain cases where there is no real need for such evidence. Before a court will take judicial notice of any fact, however, that fact must be a matter of common and general knowledge well-established and authoritatively settled, not doubtful or uncertain. *Communist Party of the United States of America v. Peek*, 20 C. 2d 536, 546 (Superior Court of Los Angeles County, 1942)

In *Communist Party v. Peek* the issue was whether the court should take judicial notice of the assertion that the Communist Party advocates force and violence. The court refused to take judicial notice, pointing with approval to the Washington supreme court's refusal to take judicial notice of the same "fact for the reason that the litigants denied it." 20 C. 2d 547, citing *State v. Reeves*, 106 P. 2d 729. The Superior Court of Los Angeles strongly implied that the denial of an alleged fact by a party to a lawsuit was alone sufficient to persuade a court not to take judicial notice of the alleged fact. 20 C. 2d 548.

In further support of its holding the court said at 546-547:

> As was pointed out in *Varcoe v. Lee*, 180 Cal. 338, 344 (181 Pac. 223), "if there were *any* possibility of dispute" the fact cannot be judicially noticed; and again (p. 345): "It is truly said that the power of judicial notice is as to matters claimed to be matters of general knowledge one to be used with caution. If there is any doubt whatever either as to the fact itself or as to its being a matter of common knowledge evidence should be required."

In *Weitzenkorn v. Lesser*, 40 C. 2d 778, 256 P. 2d 947 (Cal. 1953), a case cited by the plaintiff, the court quoted some of the same statements set forth above, and went on to refuse to take judicial notice "of the contents of published books in deciding whether Weitzenkorn's claim of originality has merit." 40 C 2d at 787.

Another case cited in the plaintiff's argument is *Galloway v. Moreno*, 183 C.A. 2d 804, 7 Cal. Rptr. 349 (1960). There it was also concluded that the court could not take judicial notice as requested by one of the parties. Two cases summarized by the plaintiff, *Frankel's Estate*, 92 N.Y. Supp. 2d 30 (1949), and Siucia'

nation that certain Europeans who had be missing since the wartime period of the 1940's could be presumed dead. It does not appear in either case that the taking of judicial notice was contested. The matters of which judicial notice was taken in those estate cases were not the same as the allegation of which the plaintiff asks this Court to take judicial notice. Besides, what may be a proper subject of judicial notice at a particular time or at a particular place may not be so at a different time or different place. *Varcoe v. Lee*, supra.

The plaintiff's request for the taking of judicial notice should be denied because it concerns a subject which is uncertain and disputable. Perhaps in no area of human knowledge are uncertainty and the need for correction more certain than in history.

"What is history but a fable agreed upon?" Napoleon Bonaparte, *Sayings*.

"History, a distillation of rumour. . ." Carlyle, *The French Revolution*.

"A fairminded man, when reading history, is occupied almost entirely with refuting it." Voltaire, *Essai sur le moeurs*.

Revisionism and the Promotion of Peace

HARRY ELMER BARNES

During the last forty years or so, Revisionism has become a fighting term. To so-called Revisionists, it implies an honest search for historical truth and the discrediting of misleading myths that are a barrier to peace and goodwill among nations. In the minds of anti-Revisionists, the term savors of malice, vindictiveness, and an unholy desire to smear the saviors of mankind.

Actually, Revisionism means nothing more or less than the effort to correct the historical record in the light of a more complete collection of historical facts, a more calm political atmosphere, and a more objective attitude. It has been going on ever since Lorenzo Valla (1407-1457) exposed the forged "Donation of Constantine," which was a cornerstone of the papal claim to secular power, and he later called attention to the unreliable methods of Livy in dealing with early Roman history. Indeed, the Revisionist impulse long antedated Valla, and it has been developing ever since that time. It had been employed in American history long before the term came into rather general use following the first World War.

Revisionism has been most frequently and effectively applied to correcting the historical record relative to wars, because truth is always the first war casualty, the emotional disturbances and distortions in historical writing are greatest in wartime, and both the need and the material for correcting historical myths are most evident in connection with wars.

Revisionism was applied to the American Revolution many years ago. Beginning with the writings of men like George Louis Beer, it was shown that the British commercial policy toward the Colonies was not as harsh and lawless as it had been portrayed by George Bancroft and others among the early ultra-patriotic historians. Others

demonstrated that the British measures imposed on the colonies after the close of the French and Indian War were in general accord with the British constitutional system. Finally, Clarence W. Alvord made it clear that Britain was more concerned with the destiny of the Mississippi Valley than she was with such disturbances as those connected with the Stamp Act, the Boston Massacre and the Boston Tea Party.

The War of 1812 was similarly subjected to Revisionist correction. Henry Adams revealed that Timothy Pickering and the extreme anti-war Federalists played a decisive role in encouraging the British to continue their oppressive commercial policies that aided the American "warhawks" in leading this country into war. They misrepresented Jefferson's commercial and naval policies to an almost treasonable extent. More recently, Irving Brant, in his notable biography of Madison, has shown that Madison was not actually pushed into war against his personal convictions by Clay, Calhoun, and the "warhawks," but made the decision for war on the basis of his own beliefs.

The Mexican War has been specifically treated by Revisionists. For a long time, historians who sought to correct the wartime passions of 1846 criticized Polk and the war group as rather conscienceless war-mongers, impelled by political ambition, who pounced without justification upon a helpless little country. Then, in 1919, along came Justin H. Smith, who, in his *The War With Mexico*, showed that there had been plenty of arrogance, defiance and provocation on the part of Santa Ana and the Mexicans.

"The Wrong War"

While the term Revisionism has been little used in connection with the process, the causes of the Civil War (War between the States) have been a field for far more extensive Revisionist research and restatement than the causes of either World War. This was made clear in the remarkable summary of Revisionist studies of the coming of the Civil War by Professor Howard K. Beale in 1946. The outcome of these scholarly efforts demonstrated that the Civil War, like General Bradley's description of the Korean

War, was "the wrong war, in the wrong place at the wrong time." Hotheads on both sides brought on the war, while judicious restraint might easily have averted the catastrophe. Professor William A. Dunning and his seminar students at Columbia University rigorously applied Revisionism to the aftermath of the Civil War and vindictive reconstruction measures piloted through Congress by Charles Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens. Their verdict was popularized in Claude Bowers' book on *The Tragic Era.*

Revisionist historians soon tackled the propaganda concerning the Spanish-American War which had been fomented by Hearst and Pulitzer and exploited by the war camp among the Republicans of 1898. James Ford Rhodes showed how McKinley, with the full Spanish concessions to his demands in his pocket, concealed the Spanish capitualtion from Congress and demanded war. Further research has revealed that there is no conclusive evidence whatever that the Spanish sank the battleship Maine and has shown that Theodore Roosevelt quite illegally started the war by an unauthorized order to Admiral Dewey to attack the Spanish fleet at Manila while Secretary Long was out of his office. Julius H. Pratt and others have exposed the irresponsible war-mongering of the "war hawks" of 1898, such as Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge and Albert J. Beveridge, and indicated the primary responsibility of Admiral Mahan for the expansionist philosophy upon which this rise of American imperialism was based.

Hence, long before the Austrian Archduke was assassinated by Serbian plotters on 28 June 1914, Revisionism had a long and impressive history and had been brought into use on all the important wars in which the United States had been engaged. Applied abroad to the Franco-Prussian War, it clearly proved that the initiative lay with France rather than Bismarck and the Prussians. But it was the first World War which brought the term "Revisionism" into general use. This was because many wished to use the historical studies of the causes of the War as the basis for a *revision* of the Treaty of Versailles, which had been based on a complete acceptance of the theory of sole German-Austrian responsibility for the outbreak of the European War in early August, 1914.

By that time, the new methods of communication, mass journalism, and greater mastery of propaganda techniques enabled the combatants to whip up popular opinion and mass hatred as never before in the history of warfare. Jonathan French Scott's *Five Weeks* revealed how the press stirred up violent hatreds in July, 1914. The intensity of feeling in the United States has recently been recalled in an impressive manner in H.C. Peterson's *Opponents of War*, 1917-1918. As C. Hartley Grattan, the present writer, and others, have pointed out, the historians scrambled on the propaganda bandwagon with great alacrity and vehemence. It was almost universally believed that Germany was entirely responsible not only for the outbreak of war in 1914 but also for American entry in April, 1917. Anyone who publicly doubted this popular dogma was in danger of the tar bucket, and Eugene Debs was imprisoned by the man who had proclaimed the War to be one to make the world safe for democracy. Debs' crime was a statement that the War had an economic basis, precisely what Wilson himself declared in a speech on 5 September 1919.

There is no space here to go into the scope and nature of Revisionist studies on the causes of the first World War. We can only illustrate the situation by citing a few of the outstanding myths and indicating the manner in which they were disposed of by Revisionists.

Crown Council Myth

The most damaging allegation brought against Germany was that the Kaiser called together a Crown Council of the leading German government officials, ambassadors, and financiers on 5 July 1914, revealed to them that he was about to throw Europe into war, and told them to get ready for the conflict. The financiers demanded two weeks delay so as to be able to call in loans and sell securities. The Kaiser acceded to this demand, and left the next day on a well-publicized vacation cruise. This was designed to lull England, France and Russia into a false sense of security while Germany and Austria-Hungary secretly got ready to leap upon an unprepared and unsuspecting Europe. The first complete statement of this charge appeared in *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story*, which was ghost written by

a leading American journalist, Burton J. Hendrick.

Professor Sidney B. Fay, the leading American Revisionist dealing with the outbreak of war in 1914, proved from the available documents that this Crown Council legend was a complete myth. Some of the persons alleged to have been at the Council meeting were not in Berlin at the time. The Kaiser's actual attitude on July 5th was completely at variance with that portrayed in the legend, and there was no such financial action as was implied. But it was a long time before it was revealed how Mr. Morgenthau got this story. It was known that he was an honorable man, and not even the most severe critics of the myth charged that he had deliberately concocted and disseminated a lie.

Many years later, Paul Schwarz, who was the personal secretary to the German Ambassador in Constantinople, Baron Hans von Wangenheim, revealed the facts. Von Wangenheim had a mistress in Berlin and, in the early days of the crisis of 1914, she demanded that he return at once to Berlin to settle some critical matters with her. He complied and, to conceal from his wife the real reason for his making the trip, he told her that the Kaiser had suddenly summoned him to Berlin. On his return, he told his wife about the fanciful Crown Council that he had dreamed up. Shortly after this with his wife by his side, von Wangenheim met Morgenthau, then the American Ambassador at Constantinople, at a diplomatic reception. Morgenthau had heard about von Wangenheim's trip to Berlin and pressed him as to what had happened. Under the circumstances, von Wangenheim could only repeat the myth he had told his wife. To what extent liquor may have lessened his restraint and how much Morgenthau and Hendrick elaborated on what von Wangenheim actually told Morgenthau are not known and probably never will be.

This fantastic tale, created out of whole cloth, both indicates the need for Revisionism and demonstrates how momentous and tragic events may hang on the most palpable fabrications. Since Morgenthau's book did not appear until 1918, his tale about the fictitious Crown Council had a great influence upon Allied propaganda against Germany at the end of the War. It was used in Lloyd George's campaign of 1918 advocating the hanging of the Kaiser and by the more vindictive makers of the Treaty of Versailles. It is

quite possible that otherwise the latter would never have been able to write the war-guilt clause into the Treaty. Since historians are agreed that it was the Treaty of Versailles which prepared the way for the second World War, the hare-brained von Wangenheim alibi of July, 1914, may have had some direct relation to the sacrifice of millions of lives and astronomical expenditures of money in the wars since 1939, with the possibility that the ultimate consequences may be the extermination of much of the human race through nuclear warfare.

Another item which was used to inflame opinion against the Germans was their invasion of Belgium. The Allied propaganda presented this as the main reason for the entry of England into the War and the final proof of the charge that the Germans had no regard for international law or the rights of small nations. Revisionist scholars proved that the British and French had for some time been considering the invasion of Belgium in the event of a European war, and that English officers had travelled over Belgium carefully surveying the terrain against this contingency. Further, the Germans offered to respect the neutrality of Belgium in return for British neutrality in the War. Finally, John Burns, one of the two members of the British Cabinet who resigned when Britian made the decision for war in 1914, told me personally in the summer of 1927 that the Cabinet decision for war had been made before a word had been said about the Belgian issue. The following year, the *Memorandum on Resignation* of the famed John Morley, the other Cabinet member who resigned in 1914 as a protest against the war policy, fully confirmed Burns' account of the matter.

Atrocity Tales

A third leading allegation which produced violent feelings against the Germans in the first World War was the charge that they had committed unique and brutal atrocities against civilians, especially in Belgium—mutilating children, women and the helpless, generally. They were said to have utilized the bodies of dead German and Allied soldiers to make fertilizers and soap, and otherwise to have behaved like degraded beasts. The distinguished British publicist, Lord James Bryce, was induced to lend his name

to the authentication of these atrocity reports. After the War, a large number of books riddled these atrocity tales, notably Sir Arthur Ponsonby's *Falsehood in Wartime*, and J.M. Read's *Atrocity Propaganda*. The first World War was no picnic, but no informed scholar today believes that any considerable part of the alleged atrocities actually took place, or that the Germans were any more guilty of atrocious conduct than the other participants in the War.

Scholars and publicists who had been condemned to silence during the War soon sought to clear their consciences and set the record straight after the close of hostilities. Indeed Francis Neilson anticipated many basic Revisionist conclusions in his *How Diplomats Make War*, which was published in 1915 and may by regarded as the first important Revisionist book on the causes of the first World War. Lord Loreburn's *How the War Came*, a scathing indictment of the English diplomats, came out at the same time that the Treaty of Versailles was drafted.

The first American scholar thoroughly to challenge the wartime propaganda was Professor Sidney B. Fay of Smith College who brought out a series of three striking articles in the *American Historical Review*, beginning in July, 1920. These first aroused my interest in the facts. During the War, I had accepted the propaganda; indeed, had unwittingly written some of it. While I wrote some reviews and short articles dealing with the actual causes of the first World War between 1921 and 1924, I first got thoroughly involved in the Revisionist struggle when Herbert Croly of the *New Republic* induced me in March, 1924, to review at length the book of Professor Charles Downer Hazen, *Europe Since 1815*. This aroused so much controversy that George W. Ochsoakes, editor of the *New York Times Current History Magazine*, urged me to set forth a summary of Revisionist conclusions at the time in the issue of May, 1924. This really launched the Revisionist battle in the United States.

Even the largest publishing houses and the best periodicals eagerly sought Revisionist material for publication. Professor Fay's *Origins of the World War*, J.S. Ewart's *Roots and Causes of the Wars*, and my *Genesis of the World War* were the leading Revisionist books in 1914 by American authors published in the United States. American Revisionists found allies in Europe: Georges Demartial, Alfred

Fabre-Luce, and others, in France; Friedrich Stieve, Maximilian Montgelas, Alfred von Wegerer, Hermann Lutz, and others, in Germany; and G.P. Gooch, Raymond Beazley, and G. Lowes Dickinson, in England. Turning from the causes of war in Europe in 1914, other scholars, notable Charles C. Tansill, Walter Millis, and C. Hartley Grattan, told the truth about the entry of the United States into the War. Mauritz Hallgren produced the definitive indictment of American interventionist diplomacy from Wilson to Roosevelt in his *A Tragic Fallacy*.

At the outset, Revisionist writing was rather precarious. Professor Fay was not in peril, personally, for he wrote in a scholarly journal which the public missed or ignored. But when I began to deal with the subject in media read by at least the upper intellectual level of the "men on the street," it was a different matter. I recall giving a lecture in Trenton, New Jersey, in the early days of Revisionism and being bodily threatened by fanatics who were present. They were cowed and discouraged by the chairman of the evening, who happened to be a much respected former-Governor of New Jersey. Even in the autumn of 1924, a rather scholarly audience in Amherst, Massachusetts, became somewhat agitated and was only calmed down when Ray Stannard Baker expressed general agreement with my remarks.

Gradually, the temper of the country changed, but at first it was caused more by resentment against our former allies than by the impact of Revisionist writings. It was the "Uncle Shylock" talk of 1924-27 which turned the trick. This indication of implied Allied ingratitude for American aid in the War made the public willing to read and accept the truth relative to the causes, conduct, merits, and results of the first World War. Moreover, with the passage of time, the intense emotions of wartime had an opportunity to cool off. By the mid-1930's, when Walter Millis's *Road to War* appeared, it was welcomed by a great mass of American readers and was one of the most successful books of the decade. Revisionism had finally won out.

Interestingly enough, as a phase of the violent anti-Revisionism after 1945, there has set in a determined effort on the part of some historians and journalists to discredit the Revisionist scholarship of 1920-1939 and return to the myths

of 1914-1920. This trend is devastatingly challenged and refuted by the eminent expert on World War I Revisionism, Hermann Lutz, in his book on *German-French Unity* (1957), which takes account of the most recent materials in the field.

Genesis of the Term

As we have already explained briefly, the historical scholarship that sought to produce the truth relative to the causes of the first World War came to be known as Revisionism. This was because the Treaty of Versailles had been directly based on the thesis of unique and sole German-Austrian responsibility for the coming of the war in 1914. By the mid-1920's, scholars had established the fact that Russia, France and Serbia were more responsible than Germany and Austria. Hence, from the standpoint of both logic and factual material, the Treaty should have been revised in accordance with the newly revealed truth. Nothing of the sort took place, and in 1933 Hitler appeared on the scene to carry out the revision of Versailles by force, with the result that another and more devastating world war broke out in 1939.

Since Revisionism, whatever its services to the cause of historical truth, failed to avert the second World War, many have regarded the effort to seek the truth about the responsibility for war as futile in any practical sense. But any such verdict is not conclusive. Had not the general political and economic situation in Europe, from 1920 onward, been such as overwhelmingly to encourage emotions and restrain reason, there is every probability that the Revisionist verdict on 1914 would have led to changes in the Versailles *Diktat* that would have preserved peace. In the United States, less disturbed by emotional cross-currents, Revisionism exerted an impressive influence, all of which worked for peace. It was partly responsible for increasing the restraint imposed on France at the time of the Ruhr invasion for the mitigation of the harsh reparations system, for the Nye investigation of the armament industry and its nefarious ramifications, and for our neutrality legislation.

The fact that, despite many months of the most vigorous and irresponsible propaganda for our intervention in the

second World War, over eighty per cent of the American people were in favor of refraining from intervention on the very eve of Pearl Harbor proves that the impact of Revisionism on the the American public mind had been deep, abiding and salutary. If President Roosevelt had not been able to incite the Japanese to attack Pearl Harbor, the Revisionist campaign of the late 1920's might have saved the United States from the tragedies of the early 1940's and what may be the greater calamities which grew out of our intervention in the second World War and still lie ahead of us.

The Role of the Mass Media

Long before the second World War broke out at the beginning of September, 1939, it was evident that, when it came, it would present an even more dramatic and formidable Revisionist problem at its close than did the first World War. The stage was all set for a much greater volume and variety of distorting hatreds than in the years before 1914, and the capacity to whip up passion and disseminate myths had notably increased in the interval. Many technical advances in journalism, larger newspaper staffs, especially of foreign "experts," and greater emphasis on foreign affairs, all made it certain that the press would play a far more effective role in swaying the masses than in 1914-18. Indeed, even in 1914, as Jonathan F. Scott and Oron J. Hale have made clear, the press was perhaps as potent a cause of the War as the folly of the heads of states and their diplomats. It was bound to exert an even more powerful and malevolent influence in 1939 and thereafter.

The techniques of propaganda had been enormously improved and were well-nigh completely removed from any moral restraint. The propagandists in 1939 and thereafter had at their disposal not only what had been learned relative to lying to the public during the first World War but also the impressive advances made in the techniques of public deceit for both civilian and military purposes after 1918. A leading English intelligence officer, Sidney Rogerson, even wrote a book, published in 1938, in which he told his fellow-Englishmen how to handle Americans in the case of a second World War, warning them that they could not just use over again the methods which Sir Gilbert Parker

and others had so successfully employed from 1914-1918 to beguile the American public. He suggested the new myths and strategy which would be needed. They began to be applied during the next year.

There was a far greater backlog of bitter hatreds for the propagandists to play upon by 1939. However much the Kaiser was lampooned and reviled during the war, he had been rather highly regarded before July, 1914. In 1913, at the time of the 25th anniversary of his accession to the throne, such leading Americans as Theodore Roosevelt, Nicholas Murray Butler and former-President Taft praised the Kaiser lavishly. Butler contended that if he had been born in the United States he would have been put in the White House without the formality of an election, and Taft stated that the Kaiser has been the greatest single force for peace in the whole world during his entire reign. There were no such sentiments of affection and admiration held in reserve for Hitler and Mussolini in 1939. Butler had, indeed, called Mussolini the greatest statesman of the twentieth century, but this was in the 1920's. British propaganda against Il Duce during the Ethiopian foray had put an end to most American admiration of him. The hatred built up against Hitler in the democracies by 1939 already exceeded that massed against any other figure in modern history. American and British conservatives hated Stalin and the Communists, and they were later linked with Germany and Hitler after the Russo-German Pact of August, 1939. This hatred of the Russians was fanned to a whiter flame when they invaded eastern Poland in the autumn of 1939 and Finland during the following winter. Racial differences and the color bogey made it easy to hate the Japanese and, after the attack on Pearl Harbor, the real facts about which were not to be known until after the War, the hatred of the Japanese went so far that even leading American naval officers like Admiral Halsey could refer to the Japanese as literally subhuman anthropoids.

Against this background it was obvious that hatreds could thrive "without stint or limit," to use Mr. Wilson's phrase, and that lies could arise and luxuriate with abandon and without any effort to check on the facts, if there were any. Every leading country set up its official agency to carry on public deception for the duration and supported it

lavishly with almost unlimited funds. It was more than evident that there would be a super-human task for Revisionism to wrestle with once hostilities had ended.

After the first World War, the Russians took the first important steps in launching Revisionism. The Communists wished to discredit the Tsarist regime and saddle it with responsibility for the first World War, so they published the voluminous documents containing the secret Franco-Russian agreements from 1892 to 1914. These, together with supplementary French materials, did prove that France, Russia and Serbia were mainly responsible for the outbreak of war in 1914. The Russian documents were followed by the publication of the archives in other countries, and I have already indicated that many important Revisionist books appeared in European countries.

Following the second World War, the overwhelming majority of Revisionist writings have been produced in the United States. There was no Tsar for the Russians to blame in 1945. Stalin desired to preserve intact the legend that he had been surprised and betrayed by Hitler in the Nazi attack of June 22, 1941. England was watching her Empire disintegrate, and the British leaders were aware of the primary responsibility of Britain for the outbreak of war in 1939; hence, every effort was made to discourage Revisionist writing in England. France was torn with hatreds far worse than those of the French Revolution, and over 100,000 Frenchmen were butchered either directly or quasi-legally during the "liberation." Only the famous journalist, Sisley Huddleston, an expatriate Englishman resident in France, the distinguished publicist, Alfred Fabre-Luce, and the implacable Jacques Benoist-Mechin, produced anything that savored of Revisionism in France. Germany and Italy, under the heels of conquerors for years, were in no position to launch Revisionist studies. Even when these countries were freed, the hatred of Hitler and Mussolini which had survived the war discouraged Revisionist work. Only Hans Grimm and Ernst von Salomon produced anything resembling Revisionism in Germany, and their works were not devoted to diplomatic history. The only book which has appeared in Germany that can literally be regarded as a Revisionist volume is the recent work of Fritz Hesse, *Hitler and the English*. This amplifies the already known fact that

Hitler lost the war primarily because of his Anglomania and his unwillingness to use his full military power against the English when victory was possible. In Italy, the eminent scholar and diplomatic historian, Luigi Villari, wrote an able book on the foreign policy of Mussolini, which is one of the substantial products of post-World War II Revisionism, but he had to get the book published in the United States. The same was true of his book on the "liberation" of Italy after 1943.

Historical Blackout

In the United States, Revisionism got off to an early start and flourished relatively, so far as the production of substantial books was concerned. This relative profusion of Revisionist literature was, however, far surpassed by the almost insuperable obstacles that were met in trying to get such literature known to the public and read by it. In other words, an unprecedented volume of Revisionist books was accompanied by an even more formidable "historical blackout" that has thus far concealed such material from the reading public.

The reasons for the relatively greater productivity of Revisionism in the United States after 1945 are not difficult to discover. There had been over four years of debate about the European and world situation between President Roosevelt's Chicago Bridge Speech of October, 1937, and the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. Most of the men who produced Revisionist books after 1945 had taken part in this great debate, had gathered materials on the issues, and were well aware of the realities and of the lies told by the Interventionists. They were eager to come forth with books to sustain their old position as soon as the end of hostilities made this possible. Pearl Harbor had only silenced them for the duration. Further, the United States had been untouched by the ravages of war, it was in good economic condition at V-J Day, and it had not lost any colonial possessions. Four years of vigorous debate before Pearl Harbor and nearly four years of passionate lying and hating after that date had at least slightly exhausted the American capacity for hatred for the time being, as compared with the existing situation in Europe and Asia. There

was at least a slight and brief breathing spell until hatreds were revived when Truman launched the Cold War in March, 1947.

Some Revisionist Books

We have space to mention only the outstanding Revisionist products in the United States. John T. Flynn's *As We Go Marching* was published in 1944, his pioneer brochures on Pearl Harbor in 1944 and 1945, and his *The Roosevelt Myth* in 1948. George Morgenstern's *Pearl Harbor* appeared in 1947; Charles Austin Beard's two volumes on Roosevelt's foreign policy were brought out in 1946 and 1948; and Helen Mears' *Mirror for Americans: Japan*, came out in 1948. William Henry Chamberlin's *America's Second Crusade* was published in 1950; Frederic R. Sanborn's *Design for War* came off the presses in 1951; Carles C. Tansill's *Back Door to War* made its appearance in 1952; the Symposium, *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace*, which I edited, presents the best anthology of Revisionist conclusions on the second World War, came out in the summer of 1953; and Richard N. Current's *Secretary Stimson* was published in 1954. Admiral R.A. Theobald's *The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor* appeared in 1954; Rene A. Wormser's *The Myth of the Good and Bad Nations* came out in the same year; Admiral H.E. Kimmel's *Admiral Kimmel's Story*, was published in 1955; Bryton Barron's *Inside the State Department* was brought out in 1956; and Elizabeth C. Brown's *The Enemy at His Back* was published in 1957.

In addition to these books by American Revisionists, there was an impressive list of volumes by Europeans who had to escape the even more stringent historical blackout at home and secure respectable publication in the United States. Such were Sisley Huddleston's books on *Popular Diplomacy and War*, and *France: the Tragic Years*; the trenchant criticisms of the war-crimes trials by Lord Hankey and Montgomery Belgion; the remarkable book of F.J.P. Veale, *Advance to Barbarism*, which criticized both the barbarous saturation bombing of civilians and the war-crimes trials; Russell Grenfell's devastating exposure of Germanophobia in his *Unconditional Hatred*; Emrys Hughes' brilliant biographical study of Winston Churchill; and Dr. Villari's vol-

umes on Mussolini's foreign policy and the Allied liberation of Italy. There were a number of other books on the periphery of literal Revisionism, of which Freda Utley's *High Cost of Vengeance*, dealing with the Allied folly and barbarism in Germany after V-E Day, is representative and one of the more notable. Along with it might be mentioned such books as Andy Rooney and Bud Hutton's *Conqueror's Peace*, Marshall Knappen's *And Call It Peace*, Milton Mayer's *They Thought They Were Free*, and Harold Zink's *American Military Government in Germany*.

What We Now Know

Not only have there been many more formidable Revisionist volumes published in the United States since 1945 than in the comparable period after 1918, but the facts revealed by this recent Revisionist research have been far more sensational than those produced by Revisionist scholars after the first World War. From 1937 onward Stalin had worked as hard for a war of attrition and mutual destruction between the capitalistic Nazi, Fascist and democratic countries as Sazonov and Izvolski did in 1914 to start a Franco-Russian-English war against Germany and Austria. Hitler, far from precipitately launching an aggressive war against Poland on the heels of brutal and unreasonable demands, made a far greater effort to avert war during the August, 1939, crisis than the Kaiser did during the crisis of July, 1914. And Hitler's demands on Poland were the most reasonable ones he made on any foreign country during his whole regime. They were far more conciliatory than Stresemann and the Weimar Republic would even consider. Poland was far more unreasonable and intransigent in 1938-39 than Serbia had been in 1914. Mussolini sought to dissuade Hitler from going to war in 1939 and made repeated efforts to summon peace conferences after the War began. Far from wantonly sticking "a dagger in the back of France" in June, 1940, he was virtually forced into the War by unneutral acts of economic strangulation on the part of Britian. France was loath to go to war in 1939, and only extreme pressure by the British Foreign Office prodded Bonnet and Daladier into reluctantly acceding to the bellicose British policy on September 2-3, 1939.

Whereas, in 1914, British responsibility for the first World War was chiefly that of weakness and duplicity on the part of Sir Edward Grey—more a negative than a positive responsibility—the British were almost solely responsible for the outbreak of both the German-Polish and the European Wars in early September, 1939. Lord Halifax, the British Foreign Minister, and Sir Howard Kennard, the British Ambassador in Warsaw, were even more responsible for the European War of 1939 than Sazonov, Izvolski, and Poincare were for that of 1914. Chamberlain's speech before Parliament on the night of September 2, 1939, was as mendacious a misrepresentation of the German position as had been Sir Edward Grey's address to Parliament on August 3, 1914.

The Case Against Roosevelt

As for American entry into the second World War, the case against President Roosevelt is far more impressive and damaging than that against Woodrow Wilson, who maintained at least some formal semblance of neutrality for a time after August, 1914. Roosevelt "lied the United States into war." He went as far as he dared in illegal efforts, such as convoying vessels carrying munitions, to provoke Germany and Italy to make war on the United States. Failing in this, he turned to a successful attempt to enter the War through the back door of Japan. He rejected repeated and sincere Japanese proposals that even Hull admitted protected all the vital interests of the United States in the Far East, by his economic strangulation in the summer of 1941 forced the Japanese into an attack on Pearl Harbor, took steps to prevent the Pearl Harbor Commanders, General Short and Admiral Kimmel, from having their own decoding facilities to detect a Japanese attack, kept Short and Kimmel from receiving the decoded Japanese intercepts that Washington picked up and indicated that war might come at any moment, and ordered General Marshall and Admiral Stark not to send any warning to Short and Kimmel before noon on December 7th, when Roosevelt knew that any warning sent would be too late to avert the Japanese attack at 1:00 P.M., Washington time.

Roosevelt also had a major responsibility, both direct and indirect, for the outbreak of war in Europe. He began to exert pressure on France to stand up to Hitler as early as the German reoccupation of the Rhineland in March, 1936, months before he was making his strongly isolationist speeches in the campaign of 1936. This pressure on France, and also England, continued right down to the coming of the War in September, 1939. It gained volume and momentum after the Quarantine Speech of October, 1937. As the crisis approached between Munich and the outbreak of war, Roosevelt pressed the Poles to stand firm against any demands by Germany, and urged the English and French to back up the Poles unflinchingly. From captured Polish and French archives, the Germans collected no less than five volumes of material consisting almost exclusively of Roosevelt's bellicose pressure on European countries, mainly France and Poland. The Allies later seized them. Only a small portion has ever been published, most notably some seized by the Germans in Poland in 1939 and published as the *German White Paper*. It is highly probable that the material covering Roosevelt's pressure on England might amount to more than five volumes. There is no certainty whatever that England would have gone to war in September, 1939, had it not been for Roosevelt's encouragement and his assurances that, in the event of war, the United States would enter on the side of Britian just as soon as he could swing American public opinion around to support intervention. Yet, when the crisis became acute after August 23, 1939, Roosevelt sent several messages for the record urging that war be avoided through negotiations.

Despite this voluminous Revisionist literature which appeared since 1945 and its sensational content, there is still virtually no public knowledge of Revisionist facts some thirteen years after V-J Day. The "man on the street" is just as prone to accept Roosevelt's "Day of Infamy" legend today as he was on December 8, 1941. A member of the state historical department of a leading eastern state recently wrote me that he had never heard of any Revisionist movement relative to the second World War until he read my article in the Spring, 1958, issue of *Modern Age*. By 1928, most literate Americans had a passable knowledge of the facts about the coming of war in 1914 and the American

entry in 1917. What are the reasons for the strange contrast in the progress of realistic knowledge after 1918 and after 1945, so our examination of the reasons for the blockage of knowledge may be limited to the United States.

A main reason why Revisionism has made little headway since 1945 in attracting public attention in the United States is that the country never really had time to cool off after the War. We have pointed out above that the situation was not as acute here after 1945 as in Europe and Japan, but it was far more tense than it was in the United States in the 1920's. Even as early as the Congressional campaign and election of 1918, there was a rift in the wartime political monolith. By the campaign of 1920, disillusionment with the war had set in and a trend toward isolation from European quarrels had begun to assert itself. The United States refused to sign the Treaty of Versailles or to enter the League of Nations. There was a cooling off period for about twenty years after 1918. As late as 1941, the overwhelming majority of the American people wished to remain aloof from the European War, and Roosevelt had great difficulty in forcing through a peacetime draft law and in getting any repeal of the neutrality legislation.

Nothing like this happened following 1945. By March, 1946, Winston Churchill was proclaiming the Cold War in his speech at Fulton, Missouri, delivered with the benediction of President Truman, and a year later Truman actually launched the Cold War. This led, in 1950, to the outbreak of a hot war in Korea. The Orwellian technique of basing political tenure and bogus economic prosperity on cold and phony warfare had taken over by 1950, to enjoy an indefinite domination over the public mind. A hot war spontaneously provides plenty of genuine, even if dangerous and misguided, emotion, but a cold war has to be built up by propaganda and mythology and sustained on synthetic excitement which is provided by planned propaganda. The tortures of "1984," as administered by the "Ministry of Love," have not as yet proved necessary in the United States. The American public proved more susceptible to simple brainwashing through propaganda than Orwell could imagine, although he was himself a veteran propagandist on the BBC. Orwellian doublethinking has enabled the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations to formulate

and enforce mutually contradictory policies, and the "crimestop" technique of the Orwellian semantic system prevents the public, and many of its leaders, from thinking through any program or proclamation. A policy of perpetual war for perpetual peace does not appear unreasonable or illogical to the American public. Thus far, the propaganda carried on by our "Ministry of Truth," with the almost unanimous aid of our press, has been sufficient to maintain popular support of the Cold War.

It is obvious that such a brainwashed and excited public is not likely to concern itself seriously with facts and writings that are designed to discredit warfare and furnish a solid basis for substantial peace. It should be about like expecting desert sheiks to concentrate on books devoted to water polo or outboard motorboat racing. The public mind has become all but impenetrable on such matters. In the mid-1920's, for the Allies to deride Uncle Sam as "Uncle Shylock" relative to a paltry 12 billion dollars of war debts made Americans so angry that they were willing to listen to Revisionist conclusions. In the mid-1950's, even such flagrantly offensive and ungrateful gestures as "Yanks Go Home," after the United States had poured tens of thousands of lives and over 65 billion dollars of foreign aid appropriations and the public appeared to approve. Congressmen like John Taber, who for years had sought to kill as many appropriations as possible which were devoted to the effort to create a better life here at home, proclaimed that foreign aid was so important that it transcended the considerations of restraint, thrift and economy which they had so long demanded of appropriations to be used within our own borders.

The Fearful Fifties

Another explanation of the antipathy or indifference of the public to Revisionism since 1945 is to be found in the sharply contrasting intellectual atmosphere of the 1920's and of the period since 1945. Conditions in the 1920's and early 1930's were the most conducive to independent and fearless thought of any decade in modern American history. This was the period of Mencken and Nathan, of the height

of the popularity of H.G. Wells. It was an era when James Harvey Robinson's *Mind in the Making* could become a best seller and Thorstein Veblen was the most respected American economist. Since 1945, we have run into a period of intellectual conformity unmatched since the supreme power and unity of the Catholic Church at the height of the Middle Ages. Between the pressures exerted by the Orwellian cold-war system and those which are equally powerful in the civilian or commercial world, intellectual individuality and independence have all but disappeared. In this era of *Nineteen Eighty-four*, "The Organization Man," "The Man in the Grey Flannel Suit," the "Hidden Persuaders," and "Madison Avenue," even the average American college graduate is no more inclined to independent thinking than was a Catholic peasant during the papacy of Innocent III.

Another reason for the unprecedented resistance of Revisionism after the second World War is the fact that the liberals and radicals, who became the shocktroops and spearhead of Revisionism in the 1920's, have since 1945 been overwhelmingly the chief opponents of any acceptance of Revisionist facts and conclusions. They were the leaders of the war party in Britian, France and the United States for months or years before 1939 and 1941, and they have never recanted. Although most of the prominent liberals heartily supported Wilson's war after 1917, they were completely disillusioned by the "Peace" Treaty and led the Revisionist parade after 1919. Especially notable were Herbert Croly and his editorial associates on the *New Republic*. They recanted, but plenty. Oswald Garrison Villard and most of his associates on the *Nation* did not need to recant, for they had never supported American intervention in 1917 with any enthusiasm.

"The Facts Be Damned"

A leading reason why the liberals and radicals have been unable to revise their pre-war views and attitudes is that their hatred of Hitler and Mussolini has been just too great to permit them to accept any facts, however well established, that might to any degree diminish the guilt with which these men were charged from 1939 onward—or from 1935, for that matter. In such a case, "facts can be dam-

ned." There was no comparable pre-war hatred of Stalin on their part for them to have to live down. The hatred of Hitler has been especially bitter among some minority groups that were notably enthusiastic about the Revisionism that followed the first World War.

Indeed, the aversion to setting down any historical facts that might present the diplomacy of Hitler and Mussolini in any more favorable light than that of wartime appears to have extended to most Revisionists of today, even to those of a conservative temperament. After the first World War, most of the Revisionist historical writing was on the European background of August, 1914. There were only three important Revisionist books written on the American entry into the War—those by Tansill, Grattan and Millis, while there were a score or more on the European situation published in Europe and the United States. The first definitive book on American entry, Tansill's *America Goes to War*, did not appear until 1938, ten years after Fay's *Origins of the World War*.

After the second World War, all of the Revisionist books written by American authors have dealt chiefly with American entry into the War. There has not been a Revisionist book or a substantial Revisionist article which sets forth the truth about 1939. The nearest approach is the able and informed treatment of the European background in Tansill's classic *Back Door to War*, but this book is devoted primarily to the American entry into the War. Either aversion to even the slightest mitigation of the wartime indictment of Hitler and Mussolini, or fear of the results, appears to have prevented even Revisionists in both the United States and Europe from having systematically tackled the crisis of 1939 in nearly twenty years after the events.

In the light of the fact that, earlier in this article, I have summarized the Revisionist conclusions about responsibility for the outbreak of the wars in 1939, it may legitimately be asked how I know about such matters if no definitive book has yet been published on this subject. All that I have stated is sustained by Professor Tansill's *Back Door to War*. But there has also recently been completed a detailed treatment of the 1939 crisis by a superbly equipped scholar. This book will rank with the monumental work of Professor Fay on 1914. I have read this manuscript with great care and

thoroughness. As a work of scholarship, it was approved by the most illustrious history department in the world today. The remaining problem is one of publication.

The anti-interventionist groups of 1937 and thereafter, like America First, were primarily conservative and for the most part welcomed the early Revisionist publications. But they soon fell in line with the Cold War because of the business advantages in industry, trade and finance which an extravagant armament program provided. Thereafter, they feared or refused to give any open support, financial or otherwise, to a scholarly movement which undermined the cold-war assumptions as thoroughly as it did the interventionist mythology of 1939-1941. Hence, Revisionism since 1947 has not only been unpopular or ignored but also poverty-stricken. On the other hand, the rich foundations have given lavish aid to the writing of anti-Revisionist books. About $150,000 was given to aid the publication of the Langer and Gleason volumes, the most impressive effort to whitewash the diplomatic record of Roosevelt and Churchill.

Other factors have led to the almost incredible obstruction of Revisionism since 1945. The excessive "security" policies and measures which have been adopted under the cold-war system have greatly increased fear and timidity on the part of public officials, scholars and general public. Since Revisionism logically challenged the whole fabric of American public policy since Pearl Harbor, it was precarious to espouse it. It has become dangerous to work for peace except through war. The press, naturally, prefers the emotion-provoking frame of reference of a Cold War to the prosaic scholarship of Revisionism. In the 1920's, the press was congenial to Revisionism because it buttressed our prevailing public policies relative to reparations, war debts, isolationism, disarmament, neutrality and the like. Today, Revisionism challenges the honesty, intelligence, and integrity of our basic foreign policies by its devastating revelation of the disastrous results of our martial world-meddling since 1937.

Especially important is the difficulty in having Revisionist books published under auspices likely to arouse public interest and knowledge and in getting them presented to the reading public honestly and effectively. There have only

been two publishers, and these relatively small ones, which have consistently published Revisionist books: the Henry Regnery Company in Chicago; and the Devin-Adair Company in New York City. Only five other small publishers have produced a Revisionist book—one book only in each of these cases save for the Yale University Press, which brought out both of Beard's volumes because the director was a close friend and great admirer of Beard. University presses have found it precarious to indulge in Revisionist publication; W.T.Couch, the able head of the University of Chicago Press, was dismissed primarily because he published so peripheral a Revisionist volume as A. Frank Reel's admirable book, *The Case of General Yamashita.*

Not one large commercial publisher in the United States has brought out a single substantial and literal Revisionist book since Pearl Harbor. This stands out in sharp contrast to the attitude of publishers toward Revisionist volumes in the 1920's and early 1930's. The largest publishers were then very eager to get such books. Professor Fay's classic work was published by the Macmillan Company, and the monumental two-volume work of John S. Ewart by Doran. Alfred Knopf published my *Genesis* and a veritable library of Revisionist books in the 1920's, but in 1953 he refused even to consider such a mild and restrained Revisionist book as Professor Current's scholarly study of the public career of Secretary Henry L. Stimson.

There are a number of obvious reasons why the big publishers shy away from Revisionist books today. In the first place, they are American citizens and, for reasons already discussed, like most of their fellow Americans, they dislike giving up their pre-war and war-time convictions, emotions, hatreds and prejudices; most of them just do not like Revisionists and Revisionism. Further, knowing that Revisionism is publicly unpopular, they realize that Revisionist books are not likely to sell well; hence, Revisionist publication is relatively poor business. Moreover, those publishers who may privately espouse Revisionism and would like to see some Revisionist books published, even if they had to do it with slight profit or even a small loss, just cannot consider a Revisionist book on its own merits or by itself alone. They have to take into account its possible effect on the general publishing trade and the book-buying

public. The loss that they could sustain through merely publishing a Revisionist volume might be nothing as compared to what they would lose by the unfortunate impression such publication might make or from the retaliation which might follow.

Fear of the Book Clubs

They are especially alarmed at the possible retaliation at the hands of the various book clubs, since all the powerful ones are tightly controlled by those groups and interests most hostile to Revisionism today. William Henry Chamberlin's *America's Second Crusade* is the one Revisionist treatment of the second World War which is admirable suited for popular sale and reading. It is precisely comparable to Walter Millis' *Road to War* on our entry into the first World War. The Millis book was a Book-of-the-Club selection and sold by the hundreds of thousands. The head of one of the largest publishing houses in the world knew and liked Chamberlin, admired his book, and personally would have liked to publish it. But he held, quite understandably, that he did not feel that he could do so in the light of his responsibilities to his stockholders. As he put it, if he published the Chamberlin book, his company probably would not get another Book-of-the-Month-Club adoption in a decade. The Chamberlin book was published by Henry Regnery.

A comparison of its fate with that of the Millis *Road to War* is instructive. Macy's, in New York City, ordered fifty copies of the Chamberlin book and returned forty as "unsold." If it could have been handled on its merits, surely five or six thousand copies would have been sold. A year after the date of publication, there was still not a copy of the book in the New York Public Library or any of its branches. Revisionist books are virtually boycotted, so far as sales to the general run of public libraries are concerned. The woman who exerts a greater influence upon library book orders than any other person in the United States is violently anti-Revisionist. She sees to it that Revisionist books are either ignored or smeared in her advice to librarians seeking guidance as to purchases.

Even when Revisionist books get into stores, clerks frequently refuse to display them and, in some cases, even lie

about their availability. In the book department of America's outstanding store, a woman sought to purchase a copy of the most widely read Revisionist book. The clerk told her decisively that the supply was exhausted and no copies were available. The customer suspected that she was lying and was able to get the head of the store to make an investigation. It was found that over fifty copies were hidden under the counter and that the clerk knew that this was the case. The head of the store was so outraged that he ordered the book department to make a special display of the hitherto concealed book.

The leading magazines are just as reluctant to publish Revisionist articles as the great commercial publishers are to publish any Revisionist books. This is also is complete contrast to the situation in the 1920's when the editors of the better periodicals were eager to get authoritative articles by leading Revisionism in the 1920's and early 1930's were solicited by the editors. So far as I know this was true of other Revisionist writers. But not a substantial Revisionist article has been printed in a popular and powerful American periodical since Pearl Harbor. The reasons for editorial allergy to Revisionist articles are the same as those that affect the heads of the large commercial publishing houses relative to Revisionist books.

Incredible as it may seem, not only publishers but even printers have sought to suppress Revisionist material. When I presented a restrained brochure, based on extensive research and designed to set forth the basic facts about the military and political career of Marshal Petain, to a printing firm in New York City, the printers refused to put the material into type unless it was approved by the censorship department of one of the most powerful and vehemently anti-Revisionist minority groups in the country. Whereupon, I took the copy to a leading upstate New York printing firm which was not accessible to this form of pressure. The episode reminded one of the pre-publication censorship which existed back in the days of Copernicus.

Fate of the Reviews

The handicaps imposed on Revisionist books are not limited to the difficulties of publication and distribution.

When these books are published they have usually been ignored, obscured or smeared. They have rarely been given decent notice or honest reviews, even if the opinion of the reviewer might be unfavorable. As one of the leading blackout organizations has advised its agents, it is preferable to ignore a book entirely if one wishes to assure killing its distribution and influence. Even a viciously unfair review will at least call attention to the volume and may arouse some curiosity and interest. To ignore it completely will do more than anything else to consign it to oblivion. Under the editorship of Guy Stanton Ford, it was the announced policy of the *American Historical Review* not to review "controversial" volumes, but, upon careful examination, it turned out that "controversial" meant "Revisionist." The most controversial anti-Revisionist books in the field were given good position and reviews as long as those usually accorded to books of comparable importance.

When Revisionist books are actually listed and reviewed, they are usually given an obscure position, often in the book notes. This was the case with Dr. Luigi Villari's book on *Italian Foreign Policy under Mussolini.* Although it was a book of major importance in diplomatic history—the only authoritative volume which had appeared on the subject—and the author was the most distinguished living authority in the field, the book was consigned to the book note section of the *American Historical Review*, and outrageously smeared. It should be pointed out, in fairness, that since Dr. Boyd C. Shafer succeeded Dr. Ford as editor, Revisionist books have been given a somewhat more decent treatment in the *American Historical Review.* Space limitations do not permit me to cite here in detail the fate of the leading Revisionist books at the hands of scholarly periodicals, and the book review sections of leading periodicals, and the newspapers. I have gone into this matter at length in the first chapter of *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace.*

The essence of the situation is that no matter how many Revisionist books are produced, how high their quality, or how sensational their revelations, they will have no effect on the American public until this public learns of the existence, nature and importance of Revisionist literature. That they have not been able to do so as yet is obvious, and the obstacles that have thus far proved effective have not been

reduced to any noticeable extent. It is for this reason that honest historians and publicists will welcome the apparent desire of the editors of *Liberation* to open its columns to a discussion of Revisionism and to the revelation of its import for the public welfare of the country. It is the first step which has been taken in this direction in a liberal magazine since Pearl Harbor.

Favoritism

Thus far I have dealt almost exclusively with the private or non-official efforts to obscure the truth relative to the causes and results of the second World War. The official censorship has been as unrelenting and in many ways more shocking. Those who publish official documents do not have to be restrained by considerations of profit and loss. More than a decade ago, Charles Austin Beard blasted the procedure of the State Department in its tendency to permit historians favorable to the official foreign policy to use the public documents rather freely, while denying such access to anybody suspected of Revisionist sympathies. This led to some momentary relaxation of censorship, and it was fortunate that Professor Tansill was able to carry on much of his research at this time. But soon the censorship and restrictions returned full force.

The Republicans promised drastic reform of this abuse when they came into power in 1953, but they failed to implement these assurances and, under Secretary Dulles, the scandal grew to far greater proportions than under Democratic auspices. The same historical advisor, Dr. G. Bernard Noble, was continued in the service and actually promoted to be Director of the Historical Division of the State Department. He was a Democrat, a Rhodes scholar, and known to be one of the most frenzied advocates of our intervention in the second World War among all American social scientists and an implacable enemy of Revisionism.

In May, 1953, the State Department promised that all records of the international conferences during the second World War would be ready for publication within a year and that all other documents on the period since 1939 would be speedily published.

Nothing was done until the spring of 1955, when the

documents on the Yalta Conference were finally published. It was evident, and soon proved, that these had been garbled and censored in flagrant fashion. Two able members of the historical staff of the Department, Dr. Bryton Barron and Dr. Donald Dozer, protested against this suppression and garbling of documents. Noble forced Barron into premature retirement without pay and discharged Dozer. The latter was reinstated by the Civil Service Commission, but Noble was able to get him discharged a second time—and this time permanently. Barron had been assigned to compile the material bearing on the Yalta Conference, and Dozer that on the Cairo-Teheran Conferences. Only one other publication has since been produced, some incomplete documents on 1939. This appeared during the last year and was also censored and garbled.

In the meantime, some 37 volumes dealing with our foreign policy since 1939 were collected and made ready for publication. But nothing was sent to the printer and, in the spring of 1958, the State Department blandly announced that it did not propose to publish any of these volumes in the predictable future. It gave as the reason the assertion that publication might possibly offend some persons among our NATO allies. To give this amazing procedure some semblance of historical authority, the State Department had appointed a hand-picked committee in 1957 to advise the Department on publication. The personnel of the committee, which did not contain one Revisionist historian, assured that the right advice would be turned in. The chairman was none other than Professor Dexter Perkins, admittedly a jolly and affable historical politician, but also one of the half-dozen outstanding and unremitting opponents of Revisionist scholarship in this country. The committee dutifully reported that publication of any of the 37 volumes lying on the shelves awaiting the government printers would not be politically expedient.

When Dr. Barron appeared before a Senatorial committee to protest against the censorship and delays, he was allowed only eleven minutes to testify, although witnesses supporting the official censorship were allowed ample time. As one of the abler editorial writers in the country commented, quite correctly: "Such a record of concealment and duplicity is unparalleled. Its only counterpart is the

'memory hole' in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, where an authoritarian regime of the future was depicted as disposing of all document and facts that failed to fit into the current party line." All this is hardly consistent with the assumed role of the United States as the leader of the "Free Nations" or with our bitter condemnation of the Russians for censoring their official documents.

There are, of course, some vital official documents dealing with the onset of the second World War that the Government has never even dreamed of publishing at any time and are so full of dynamite that not even historians engaged in whitewashing the official record are allowed to use them. Such are the so-called "Kent Documents," namely, the nearly 2000 secret messages illegally exchanged in the American code between Churchill and Roosevelt from September, 1939, onward. Churchill, himself, has frankly told us that these documents contain most of the really vital facts about the collaboration between him and Roosevelt in their joint efforts to bring the United States into the War. When the most impressive historical effort to whitewash the Roosevelt-Churchill record was about to be undertaken, Churchill threatened the principal author with a court suit if he made use of these "Kent Documents."

The suppression of documents relative to responsibility for the second World War extends, of course, far beyond all Anglo-American activities and relations. When the Communists and Socialists in Russia, Germany and Austria published their archives following 1918 in order to discredit the old imperial regimes, this forced the British and French ultimately to do the same. Eventually, scholars had virtually all the factual material at their disposal.

Nothing like this has been possible after the second World War. The victorious Allied Powers, chiefly Britain and the United States, captured the German and Italian archives, except for some of the more vital Italian materials which the Italian Communists destroyed, with Allied connivance, when they captured and murdered Mussolini. Today, Germany and Italy could not publish all their documents even if they wished to do so, for they do not possess them. Some have been returned to Italy, and the Germans have been promised theirs. But one may be sure than any material which seriously reflects on the United States and

Britian will not be included. Publication thus far has been limited to what the American and British authorities have seen fit to release, and there is no evidence that it has been any more fully and honestly presented than the documents on the Yalta Conference. Nor can the Germans and Italians be expected to publish anything likely to modify the wartime indictment of Hitler and Mussolini. Unlike the Weimar Republic, the Adenauer Government is vigorously opposed to Revisionist scholarship and publication. The same is true of the Italian Government.

The main import of all this official censorship is that the Revisionist verdict relative to responsibility for the second World War is far less drastic than it will be if and when all the documents are available. If the documents now suppressed in such abundance and with such thoroughness would lessen the already severe indictment of the wartime leaders, elementary logic and strategy support the assumption that they would have been published long before the present moment in order to modify or eliminate the severe judgments already set forth in existing Revisionist volumes.

One paradox should be noted relative to the status and results of Revisionism after the two World Wars. After the first World War, the Revisionist verdict as to the responsibility for the war was very generally accepted by scholars and intelligent public leaders, but little was done about it in the way of revising the European post-war system that had been based on the lies and propaganda of wartime. If the logical steps had been taken to revise the post-war treaties while the German Republic was in existence, it is unlikely that Hitler would ever have risen to power in Germany, that there would ever have been any second World War, or that any Cold War would have come on it heels. After the second World War, while the facts brought forth by Revisionism as to the responsibility for the War have been ignored, indeed, are virtually unknown to the publics among the victorious Allies, there has been an almost complete revision of public policy toward our former enemies. Both Germany and Japan have been almost forcibly rearmed and given extensive material aid so that they can now function as allies against our former ally, Soviet Russia. One can imagine the outcry if, say in 1925, we had insisted that Germany and Austria must re-arm to the hilt

and we had expressed our determination to enable them to do so.

Any such situation as has taken place since 1945 could only be possible in an era of Orwellian double-thinking and "crimestop." We spent about 400 billion dollars to destroy Germany and Japan and, after their destruction, we have poured in more billions to restore their military power. If it were conceivable that we could fight a third world war without exterminating all the participants, we might envisage a situation where, after destroying Russia, we proceeded to give her billions to rebuild her fighting power to defend us against China and India.

One lesson that Revisionism might teach us is that we should learn from it public attitudes which could protect us against repeated folly and tragedy. The eminent philosopher, John Dewey, told a friend of mine that if he had not been so wrong in his attitude toward the first World War (as exemplified by his *German Philosophy and Politics*), he might have succumbed to the propaganda that led us into the Second World War. But publics appear to profit less by experience than pragmatic philosophers. They seem to vindicate Hegel's classic observation that the only lesson that history teaches us is that we learn nothing from history. In an age of hydrogen bombs, intercontinental guided missiles, terrifyingly lethal chemical and bacterial warfare, and pushbutton military technology, we shall have to do better than the publics of Hegel's time if we are to have any prospect of survival or of attaining such a degree of peace, security, and well-being as would justify survival. But the American public can hardly learn any lesson from Revisionism if it does not even know that it exists, to say nothing of its content and implications.

Unless and until we can break through the historical blackout, now supported even by public policy, and enable the peoples of the world to know the facts concerning international relations during the last quarter of a century, there can be no real hope for the peace, security and prosperity which the present triumphs of science and technology could make possible. The well-being of the human race, if not its very survival, is very literally dependent on the triumph of Revisionism.

Book Reviews

THE HOLOCAUST AND THE HISTORIANS, by Lucy S. Dawidowicz, Harvard University Press, 187pp, $15.00, ISBN 0-674-40566-8.

"What, in sanctifying the Holocaust, do Jews *not* want to know about that grim era?" (Quoted from "The Holocaust, and the Myth of the Past as History," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter, 1980, Dr. Howard F. Stein)

Mrs. Lucy S. Dawidowicz' *The Holocaust and the Historians* is remarkable more for what it does not say than for the actual content of this meager book. In a recent review in the *The New York Times*, John Leonard charaterized Mrs. Dawidowicz' work "confused." Confused it is—and evasive.

Except for a brief footnote on Arthur R. Butz's *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, which Mrs. Dawidowicz calls an "overtly anti-Semitic work," there is no mention of the significant writings of Faurisson, Rassinier and Felderer. Instead, Mrs. Dawidowicz refers readers to her tacky *Commentary* article, "Lies About the Holocaust," again smearing Revisionist historians as "neo-Nazi."

In spite of the fact that we are almost literally *bombarded* night and day, week after week in the newspapers and mass media with various aspects of the Holocaust myth, Mrs. Dawidowicz is fearful that the history of the alleged six million murdered Jews will be obliterated from the face of the earth. And in order to sanctify this supposed unique aspect of suffering, Mrs. Dawidowicz makes a supreme effort to downplay the horrors of Hiroshima, Dresden and Vietnam. It is as if to say "Our suffering has more meaning than yours," as Dr. Howard F. Stein states in his courageous *Journal of Historical Review* article cited above.

Mrs. Dawidowicz uses the opportunity given her in this book to jump on the "anti-Hannah Arendt" bandwagon. Hannah Arendt, probably the most brilliant of Jewish essayists, had the effrontery to infuriate the Jewish establishment by her critical comments on the role of the *Judenrate* and such people as the Rothschilds in the undoing of their people. The Ghetto bureaucrats and "court bankers," according to Hannah Arendt, profited from the govern-

ments, misguided the Jewish masses and were the *actual* agents of anti-Semitism!

The student wishing to find some information on the origins of the wars of this century will find this book of little value. Indeed the destruction of the culture of Ashkenazic Jewry was a great tragedy, but one can find few clues as to how this might have been averted in Mrs. Dawidowicz' work.

What is missing in *The Holocaust and the Historians* are the First and Second acts. The barrage of anti-German propaganda in the thirties and the battle for a negotiated peace in 1944 are two subjects that would bear further investigation by our historians. A negotiated peace in 1944 would surely have saved many Jewish (and other) lives! Reading history through the Third act is well for Mrs. Dawidowicz but it obviously will not do for those of us who wish to avoid future wars and future "holocausts."

Mrs. Dawidowicz makes much of the writings of Fritz Fisher in an effort to bolster her theory of the "continuity" of German history and the idea of "Germany As the Aggressor Throughout the Ages." It is remarkable that such nonsense can still be taken seriously. Fischer's thesis has been demolished elsewhere but the corpse of "unique German culpability" still has not been interred.

In criticizing Mrs. Dawidowicz' latest work this reviewer would like to point out a defect of both Revisionist and anti-Revisionist writing. To a point we should attempt to make a more accurate location of who the "good-guys" and "bad-guys" were in the historical process. But most Revisionists and anti-Revisionists understand nothing whatever what the *forces* are which cause different people or "historical personages" to act the way they do. Only a few think in this frame of reference. Proudhon once said, "Not to the man, legislator, or prince do we look for the meaning of his acts, but to the acts themselves," implying that the actors in any historical event did not understand what motivated them, except from an extremely short-range view. They had little or no comprehension whatever of the larger evolutionary course of events. In this respect more intense study by Revisionists of the American and European individualist anarchists (or libertarian socialists) and the writings of some of the psychohistorians-Howard F. Stein, Henry Ebel, George Kren, and David R. Beisel would be very useful in addition to the writings of Lawrence Dennis and C.H. Douglas.

The Holocaust and the Historians however has some "tidbits" which unintentially substantiate Revisionist interpretations. In a revealing footnote Mrs. Dawidowicz states:

"Many thousands of oral histories by survivors recounting their experiences exist in libraries and archives around the world. Their quality and usefulness vary significantly according to the informant's memory, grasp of events, insights, and of course accuracy. Also important in determining the quality of the account is the interviewer's ability to pursue lines of inquiry that elicit information that has been subconsciously or deliberately suppressed or that supplements an already accumulated body of information on a given subject or place. The longer the time elapsed, the less likely that the informant has retained freshness of recollection or can offer new information. The transcribed testimonies I have examined have been full of errors in dates, names of participants, and places, and there are evident misunderstandings of the events themselves. To the unwary researcher, some of the accounts can be more hazard than help."

It is encouraging to know that at long last many intellectuals of Jewish origin (such as John-Gabriel Cohn Bendit, Claude Karnooh, Jacob Assous) are beginning to recognize the real nature of the Holocaust—"that Nazism is indeed the bogeyman used by the liberal democracies to obtain the submission of their populations."

Mrs. Dawidowicz' book comes after a year of unremitting attack and smear of The Institute for Historical Review, Liberty Lobby, *The Spotlight*, beginning with Mrs. Dawidowicz' own article in *Commentary*, continuing with Paul Berman's vicious diatribe in *Village Voice* (N.Y.), and articles in *Los Angeles Magazine* and *New Republic* (Mark Hosenball). These hatchet jobs completely fail to come to grips with the substance of the Revisionist argument. The alleged "racism," "anti-Semitism" of all "Willis Carto-associated" publications and organizations is repeatedly used to stifle all Revisionist argument, and indeed an attempt is being made now to smear the Serge Thion-libertarian socialist group in France with the same "anti-Semitic" brush. It may very well be that general acceptance of Revisionist interpretations will have to wait until the year 2050. If so, the lessons will be very costly. The prime noodles of civilization created the appropriate conditions for Lenin, Mussolini and Hitler and later, a veritable mass of petty dictators (of both Fascist and Socialist-Communist variety) in the 1946-1981 period.

While America grovels under the yoke of Volcker and the infamous Federal Reserve System, a vast military-industrial complex, organized crime, cowardly and venal politicians, and the disintegration of safety and public order in our cities we are still preoccupied with the fantasies of "internationalism," notwithstanding the complete and utter failure of liberal-conservative policy since 1917, a policy in which a small, entrenched

financial elite has made tremendous gains at the expense of the many. Mrs. Dawidowicz' latest opus is just one more "brief for the Establishment."

—*Bezalel Chaim*

BY BLOOD AND FIRE, by Thurston Clarke, G.P.Putnam's Sons, Hb, $12.95.

In these days of erotic fiction and strange "documentaries" on the market, it is rewarding to read an excellant non-fiction book on a little known subject that hasn't been widely documented.

By Blood and Fire is virtually a scenario of one of the most contemptible acts of unmitigated murder by terrorism of the Twentieth Century; the deliberate bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, 22 July 1946.

Author Thurston Clarke, who's other literary credits are *The Last Caravan* and *Dirty Money*, has done a masterful job in research of a painful subject that places the blame for this horrible terrorist attack on the present Prime Minster of Israel, Menahem Begin.

At just past noon on 22 July 1946, six members of Begin's *Irgun zvai leumi* crept into the basement entrance of the King David Hotel, placed seven steel milk churns filled with gelignite and TNT in the popular Regency Bar and blew up the entire south wing of the hotel, killing 91 British civil servants, Arabs and Jews and wounding 46.

The reasoning behind such an act is as strange as the acts of terrorism committed by Jews and Arabs in Palestine today. What these murders accomplish seems to be a mute question. Any mention of this bombing attack to Prime Minister Begin today brings on stoney silence accompanied by a statement, "they were given a warning beforehand."

Much of the value of this book lies in the chronology; the time table of events by these "soldiers" of the terrorist *Irgun*, and goes into detail how Begin, the commander-in-chief of the *Irgun*, disregarded the pleas of the *Haganah* and the powerful "X Committee" and even Dr. Chaim Weizmann the chief Zionist of the entire Isreli movement, not to engage in an act of terrorism against the British "caretakers" of Palestine.

The six story King David Hotel in Jerusalem was one of the most popular meeting places in the city. The British administrative offices were in the south wing of the hotel and those employed were innocent British civil servants including 17 Jews, all of whom were murdered in the tremendous blast.

It is difficult to understand the rationale of such an act, except to remember that the Arabs outnumbered the Jews over the years

and it is still an enigma as to "whom does Palestine belong to?"

Because of all the Arab and Jewish unrest in 1939 when thousands of Jews "emigrated" to Israel, the caretaker Government of Great Britain issued a *White Paper* stating that "no more than 75,000 Jews would be allowed to immigrate into Palestine in the coming 5 years." This declaration was as unpopular to the resident Arabs as the invading Jews, and brought about terrorism towards the British from Jew and Arab alike.

Following Hitler's passage of the law allowing German nationals to repurchase their commercial and residential property at the same price they were forced to sell to wealthy Jews after World War I, the German Jews were stripped of their financial power and left Germany in droves to immigrate into Palestine against the wishes of the British Government.

Thurston Clarke walks a tightrope depicting the objectives of both Arabs and Jews as well as British interests. He takes no sides and makes use of documented evidence and eye witness accounts of the bombing.

Excellent photographs, maps and diagrams are included in the book, available in selected bookstores and in many public libraries.

—*W.R. Silberstein*

CZECHOSLOVAKIA'S ROLE IN SOVIET STRATEGY, by Josef Kalvoda, University Press of America, Pb, 382pp, $9.75.

The author, a professional historian, was born in Czechoslovakia in 1923, left the CSR in 1948, has been living in the USA since 1951 and presently teaches at St. Joseph's College in West Hartford, Conn.

Prof. Kalvoda has given us a meticulous and scholarly account of the Soviet takeover of Czechoslovakia. Kalvoda plowed through piles of notes, documents and books mainly of Czech, but also of Russian, Austrian and German origin. The 82 pages of bibliography are extremely valuable.

The author begins in 1914, when Czech and Slovak contingents of the Austrian army at the Russian front shot their Austrian officers and defected to the Russian enemy. In the same year, Thomas G. Masaryk, later president of Czechoslovakia, made his first contact with British authorities, seeking support in his drive for Czech independence. The British Government prefered an independent Czech state to one attached to the Russian empire. Three years later, the British sent Masaryk to Russia to organize a Czech Legion there from 250,000 Czech and Slovak defectors in that country. Masaryk immediately asserted himself as Commander-in-Chief of a 50,000 man legion which he put under French command, a purely theoretical arrangement, since the

Legion never arrived on the Western front.

The history of this Czech Legion is described in detail. One is astonished to learn, that in May 1918, Leon Trotzky, following higher orders, tried to incorporate these Czecho-Slovaks into the Red army and assorted labor groups. Some American and British leaders wished that these men could have helped them in their effort to defeat the Bolsheviks, but Masaryk held stubbornly to his policy of neutrality towards the Bolsheviks and even suggested that the Allies recognize the Red regime. Thus, Masaryk was one of the first politicians to bolster Bolshevism.

Eduard Benesh, portrayed by Kalvoda as a liar, cheater, and weak character, was another self-appointed politician who played a leading role in bringing the CSR into the Bolshevik fold: a "quartermaster of Communism in Central Europe." Or as chancellor Smutny called him: "The greatest Machiavelli of our time." (It is known, for example, that Benesh during the negotiations for the 1919 Treaty of St. Germain presented a forged map, which minimized the German population to be incorporated into the new CSR from 3.5 Million inhabitants to 1.2 Million.)

Benesh was cold-shouldered by the other Czech exiles, but with Russian help, managed to assert himself as their leader and while in Washington in May 1943, he assured F.D. Roosevelt of Soviet harmlessness and trustworthyness. When planning for the post-war Czechoslovakia, Benesh, in agreement with British and American authorities, originally intended to make concessions in favor of Germany. It was Stalin, who, in Dec. 1943, told him that he wanted Germany completely weakened and suggested that Sudeten Germans (as well as Hungarians) be evicted from the CSR. As Benesh put it later: "The transfer of the German property will be the beginning of a great social transformation."

Kalvoda's descriptions and analysis are excellent. He shows that Benesh was the main grave-digger of an independent Czechoslovakia. Yet, in his final conclusion he fails to emphasize the full implications which the expulsion of 3.5 Million Sudenten Germans had on the country: namely the permanent protection by "Big Brother" against any possible "justice seeking" by Sudeten Germans that might occur in the future.

Furthermore, I cannot agree with Kalvoda's assertions that Czechslovakia between 1918-38 had a "strong democratic tradition." Aside from the fact that the Sudeten German, Hungarian, Polish, and Ukrainian minorities were completely outmaneuvered in the Czech parliament, incidents like the machine-gunning of peaceful demonstrators in Troppau and Kaaden on 4 March 1919, which left 54 dead and 107 wounded, were a far cry from "democratic traditions!"

—*W.K.F. Schuldes*

DEFEAT IN THE EAST: Russia Conquers—January to May 1945, by Juergen Thorwald, edited and translated by Fred Wieck, Bantam Books, Pb, 292pp with maps and drawings, $2.50, ISBN 0-553-13469-8.

Most of the actual fighting during the Second World War took place on the Eastern Front between the Soviet Union and Germany and her allies. The last stages of the war in the East are vividly described by the German jounalist and historian, Juergen Thorwald. In *Defeat in the East*, Thorwald traces the military debacle of the Third Reich and shows what happened to the civilian population wherever the Red Army conquered.

The author participated in the rescue of refugees in eastern Germany and interviewed civilian and military survivors of the final collapse. On the basis of his own experience and interviews, as well as documentation available in the immediate post-war period, Thorwald was able to reconstruct a story that is still little known in the West. The book at hand is a translation based on a two-volume German work of more than seven hundred and fifty pages. It first appeared in an English language edition in 1951, under the title *Flight in Winter*, published by Pantheon Books, and has recently been reprinted as one of the titles in the popular Bantam War Books Series.

At the beginning of June 1944, Axis troops still controlled much Russian territory. Later that month, two hundred twenty-five Soviet infantry and armored divisions smashed through German Army Group Center, comprised of forty understrength divisions. On 23 August 1944, Romania left the Axis and the Red Army drove on into Hungary. People of German descent caught in the Russian steamroller were tortured, murdered, or deported. Refugees streamed into Austria.

By late fall, General Heinz Guderian, Chief of the German Army General Staff, managed to scrape together fourteen divisions of reserves for deployment against the Russians. They were instead frittered away in Hitler's fruitless December offensive in the Ardennes. When the new Russian drive commenced during the second week of January 1945, the German front lines disintegrated.

In almost every German settlement, village, or town where the Red Army advanced, the Russian troops engaged in an orgy of rape, murder, looting, and deportation. Women over seventy and girls under twelve were gang-raped, drafted for forced labor, and the healthier ones frequently rounded up, packed into cattlecars and transported to Russia. For over three years, the Communist propagandist Ilya Ehrenburg had promised Red Army troops the German women as their booty. Soviet officers often read to their soldiers Ehrenburg's enjoinder to: "Kill, Red Army men, Kill! No fascist is innocent, be he alive, be he as yet unborn.

Kill!" As one eyewitness to the events reported, "It seemed as though the devil himself had come to Silesia. The 'Mongol barbarism of the Asiatic plains' had come not in a propaganda phrase but in the flesh. From January into April there raged a seemingly planless regime of looting, rape, and murder. Every German was fair game, all German property booty."

But the wholesale acts of atrocity committed against the German civilian populations of Eastern Europe were not planless. Instead, they were part of a preconceived plan designed to drive out all Germans and annex areas to the Soviet Union and pro-Soviet Poland. When the British and Americans bombed the defenseless Saxon capital of Dresden on 13-14 February 1945, killing thousands of the civilians who had sought refuge there, it appeared to be a further implementation of an Allied plan. During the December Ardennes offensive, the Germans captured enemy documents concerning Operation "Eclipse," codename of the notorious design inspired by U.S. Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, which called for the destruction of the German nation following the allied victory.

Although the Soviets and their Western Allies had complete control of the air and held vast superiority in ground forces, the Germans tenaciously fought on. Boys of twelve and over from the Hitler Youth were given hasty lessons in the use of rifles, machineguns, or Panzerfausts (a bazooka-like anti-tank weapon), and sent to the shrinking front lines, often joining the elderly men of the *Volksturm* (People's Militia). German military commanders continued to offer resistance in the East wherever such action served to cover the escape of the refugees. As they retreated, the Germans tried, with varying success, to surrender to British and American forces.

Thorwald discusses efforts by members of Hitler's entourage to negotiate with the West in order to end the fighting against the Anglo-Americans and concentrate their remaining resources on resisting the Russians. Following Hitler's suicide, his successor, Admiral Karl Doenitz, issued a proclamation which summarized his goal, "My first task is to save the German people from destruction by the Bolshevist enemy. Fighting continues only to serve this one purpose. Only so far as this purpose is being opposed by the Americans and the English, only so far will we have to defend ourselves against them also."

Doenitz attempted to bring about a partial surrender on the Western Front, but the Allied Supreme Commander, General Eisenhower, demanded unconditional surrender to all the Allies simultaneously. Having no alternative, the Doenitz government capitulated in early May.

For many in Eastern Europe, VE Day did not end their suffering. The author recounts the fate of the Germans living in

Czechoslovakia who were tortured and often murdered until the last of them fled the country. Germans were not the only ones victimized: Russian POWs, some of them members of General Vlassov's Army and Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia, were arrested as henchmen of Hitler and turned over to the Soviets.

Juergen Thorwald has drawn attention to a topic that has been played down in the post-war years. *Defeat in the East* should be read in company with Alfred de Zayas' *Nemesis at Potsdam* and Nikolai Tolstoy's *The Secret Betrayal* (available from the IHR at $9.00 and $16.00 respectively, reviewed in JHR #4, Winter 1980), which describe in detail the post-war torments suffered by Germans and Russians at the hands of the victors. Anyone perusing these important volumes will no longer be convinced the Nazis had a monopoly on "war crimes."

Reviewing this period of history, Harry Elmer Barnes observed that, "Even if one were to accept the most extreme and exaggerated indictment of Hitler and the national socialists for their activities after 1939 made by anybody fit to remain outside a mental hospital, it is almost alarmingly easy to demonstrate that the atrocities of the Allies in the same period were more numerous as to victims and were carried out for the most part by methods more brutal and painful than alleged extermination in gas ovens."

—Charles Lutton

DOENITZ AT NUMREMBERG: A RE-APPRAISAL, edited by H.K. Thompson, Jr. and Henry Strutz, preface by Justice William L. Hart, Amber Publishing (available from the IHR), Hb, 230pp heavily illustrated $11.00, ISBN 0-916788-01-6.

This exceptionally comprehensive book was dedicated to Admiral Karl Doenitz, "a naval officer of unexcelled ability and unequalled courage who, in his nation's darkest hour, offered his person and sacrificed his future to save the lives of many thousands of people."

The editors, in their introduction, talk about the purpose of the book being "a sampling of up-dated qualified opinion on the Nuremberg and related 'war crimes trials' of Axis personnel conducted by the Allies after WW II, with emphasis on the trial of Doenitz."

Dan V. Gallery, Rear Admiral, U.S.N (Ret.), in his prologue, refers to the International Military Tribunal (IMT) as "a kangaroo court . . . with men whose hands were bloody sitting on the judges seats."

In this book are excerpts from pp215-219 of *Profiles of Courage* by Pres. John F. Kennedy who lauds the October, 1946 position taken by Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio, who was disturbed by the war crimes trials of Axis leaders. Kennedy asserts "the Nuremberg trials were at no time before the Congress for consideration . . . not an issue in the campaign . . . but Bob Taft spoke out. Quotes Taft: "About this whole judgement there is the spirit of vengeance, and vengeance is seldom justice. In these trials we have accepted the Russian idea of the purpose of trials—government policy and not justice— with little relation to Anglo-Saxon heritage. By clothing policy in the forms of legal procedure, we may discredit the whole idea of justice in Europe for years to come . . . " Kennedy reasserts what the Ohio Senator insisted: Nuremberg "was a blot on American Constitutional history and a serious departure from our Anglo-Saxon heritage of fair and equal treatment . . . . "

The book itself comprises 194 pages, with signed statements from approximately 380 world leaders, spokesmen, and people of prominence—many of them military—condemning the trials as a "travesty of justice," "violation of international law," "hypocritical," "unjust," "unfair," "contemptible," "a step backward in international law" according to Judge Learned Hand.

Distinguished contributors include: Vice Adm. W.L. Ainsworth, Rear Admirals C. Alexandris and J.E. Arnold; Hon. J.H. Ball; Prof. H.E. Barnes; Hon. S. Draden and U.L. Burdick; Taylor Caldwell, W.H. Chamberlin; Lady E.M. Chetwynd; Prof. Kenneth Colgrove; P.A. del Valle, Lt. Gen; Justice William O. Douglas; T.S. Eliot; Brig. Gen. B. Fellers; J.H. Gipson of Caxton Printers; Prof. W.E. Hocking; Adm. H.E. Kimmel; Hon. W. Langer and J.B. Lee; Adolph Menjou; Vice Adm. A.E. Montgomery; Flt. Adm. C.W. Nimitz; Adm. Sir H.A. Packer; Adm. J.W. Reeves; Brig. Gen. A. Skeen; Lt. Gen. G.E. Stratemeyer; Prof. C.C. Tansill; Hon. F.J.P. Veale; Rear Adm. J. Wainwright; Gen. A.C. Wedemeyer; Hon. Burton K. Wheeler—among many other distinguished contributors.

This is a truly intriguing and revealing work which sets the record straight on some of the most bizarre judicial proceedings of the Twentieth Century. What is most painfully evident from this distinguished volume is not only that Doenitz and many, many others committed no crimes, but those who passed verdicts on them at Nuremberg did. This is a book not only for students of military and naval history, but for all who are interested in seeking justice and an understanding of how it can be dangerously perverted to serve the interests of the savagely vengeful.

—*T.D. Hendry*

NOT TO THE SWIFT: THE OLD ISOLATIONISTS IN THE COLD WAR ERA, by Justus D. Doenecke, Bucknell University Press, Hardback, $17.50, ISBN 0-8387-1940-6.

Justus D. Doenecke's book is a veritable gold-mine of information for the serious scholar of Revisionist historiography. Although lacking the minute detail of a similar work, James J. Martin's *American Liberalism and World Politics*, it nevertheless will prove a fruitful source for future scholars delving into the immediate post-World War II period.

The views of Lawrence Dennis, Harry Elmer Barnes, John T. Flynn, Charles Callan Tansill, Charles A. Lindbergh, Norman Thomas, Frank Chodorov, Henry Regnery, William Henry Chamberlin, Frank Hanighen, and several dozen others are examined as to their attitude toward world events in the 1945-1960 period.

Although obviously sympathetic to the views of say, Lawrence Dennis—since Doenecke is an 'academic' historian (of the "He said it; not I" school—lip-service must be paid to anti-McCarthyism and there is a rather gratuitous anti-McCarthyism thrown in. McCarthy's escapades were after all, small time "stuff" compared to the exploits of Roosevelt and his "liberal" entourage.

In his acknowledgments Dr. Doenecke neatly juggles the names of James J. Martin and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., two very disparate figures, but the Professor perhaps should be forgiven his tightrope-walking. He has produced an eminently readable account of some of the most interesting American historians and publicists of the last fifty years.

—*Bezalel Chaim*

About the Contributors

JAMES J. MARTIN graduated in history from the University of New Hampshire in 1942 and received his MA (1945) and Ph.D. (1949) degrees in history from the University of Michigan. He has taught history at educational institutions from coast to coast. His first book *Men Against the State* is widely regarded as the best history of early American libertarianism and anarchism. Dr. Martin has since written and edited a large number of history texts.

HARRY ELMER BARNES (1889-1968) is generally regarded as the founding father of Historical Revisionism. The first-ever Revisionist Convention in 1979 was dedicated to his memory. He authored scores of books and hundreds of articles, which take up *forty-seven* pages of listings in his biography. The best introduction to his writings is *The Barnes Trilogy* (IHR, 1979, $4).

WILLIS A. CARTO founded the Institute for Historical Review in 1978 and serves as the treasurer of Liberty Lobby, Inc., publisher of *The Spotlight*, a weekly newspaper out of Washington D.C.

MARK WEBER was born and raised in Oregon and was educated at various universities around the world: Portland (OR) State University, University of Illinois, University of Munich, and Indiana State University. In 1976 he obtained his BA with high honors in history, and in 1977 he was awarded an MA in central European History. He now works in Washington DC as a freelance researcher, author and German translator.

BEZALEL CHAIM is an Editor of Revisionist Press, a scholarly book publisher in New York City. He is currently editing a series of original monographs in the areas of Jewish libertarian socialism and anarchism, the history of the Jewish Khazars and free banking theory.

CHARLES LUTTON lectures on the political and military history of the Twentieth Century at an institute in the western United States. His articles and reviews, in the fields of economics, military history, and international affairs, have appeared in both scholarly and popular journals in the United States and Europe.